44716

National Library of Canada
Canadian Theses Division
Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Division des thèses canadiennes

PERMISSION TO MICROFILM — AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type — Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

Full Name of Author — Nom complet de l'auteur

JOSE ANTONIO CORREIA

Date of Birth — Date de naissance

MARCH 19, 1951

Country of Birth — Lieu de naissance

PORTUGAL

Permanent Address — Résidence fixe

7307 - 138 AVE.

Title of Thesis — Titre de la thèse

A Paradigmatic History of Spanish Education History, 1812 to 1970

University — Université

U. of A.

Degree for which thesis was presented — Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

M. Ed.

Year this degree conferred — Année d'obtention de ce grade

1980

Name of Supervisor — Nom du directeur de thèse

Harry Garfinkle

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

Date

April 28, 1980

Signature

J. Correia

NL-91 (4/77)

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NL-339 (Rev. 8/80)

The University of Alberta

A Paradigmatic Interpretation of Spanish Educational History, 1812 to 1970

by

(C) Jose Antonio Correia

A Thesis

submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

Department of Educational Foundations

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring, 1980.

The University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled

A Paradigmatic Interpretation

of

Spanish Educational History,

1812 to 1970

submitted by Jose Antonio Correia

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Harry Garfield
Supervisor

David H. Wangler

David C. Johnson

Date May 16, 1980

Abstract

Educational development does not cause national development but is an effect of that development.

The aim of this thesis is to explore the relationship between education and the societal pattern which is its belief of reality.

The thesis presented is that the ruling classes of society impose a pattern of values, knowledge, and reality upon the rest of the population. This pattern is revealed in all the institutions of society, including education, to a greater or lesser degree.

The thesis is divided into three parts and eight chapters. The first chapter deals with the definition and description of the concept of paradigms. Part one covers the period from 1812 to 1868 and is divided into two chapters: chapter two describes the attempt to establish a more modern educational system; chapter three describes the tentative beginnings of educational reform and its problems. Part two covers the period from 1868 to 1939 and is divi- into two chapters: chapter four describes the gradual development and extension of education; chapter five examines the educational reforms of the various governments of the day with an emphasis on both Giner and the Second Republic. Part three covers the years from 1939 to 1970 and is divided into two chapters: chapter six examines the educational policy of the Franco regime and its effect on the socio-economic structure of the country; chapter seven examines the Education Act of 1970.

Hopefully, I will show that the history of Spanish education, and by extension all education, shows the constant pull forwards and backwards of the paradigmatic influences originating from the changes occuring in the power structure of society. To develop, therefore, requires the reform of the general power structure of society before education can be developed to meet the needs of the society in general.

***

This thesis concentrates primarily on the public educational system

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Harry Garfinkle for the aid and encouragement given in the preparation of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Research Hypotheses	2
Hypothesis 1	2
Hypotheses 2 & 3	3
Hypothesis 4	9
Hypothesis 5	11
Limits of P. Analysis	11
Part I. Conflict and Control, 1812-1868	
II. Modernity and Tradition, 1812-1834	19
Paradigmatic Influence	22
Education	25
State of Education	28
III. Development and Neglect, 1834-1868	31
Paradigmatic Influence	31
Education	32
Educational Aims	33
Curriculum	35
Effects of Education	36
State of Education	37
Part II. Polarization and Conflict, 1868-1939	
IV. Freedom and Conservatism, 1868-1898	42
Paradigmatic Influence	42

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Paradigmatic Influence on Education 45

Educational Aims 45

Curriculum 47

Effects of Education 50

State of Education 54

V. Radicalism and Conservatism, 1898-1939 59

Paradigmatic Influence 59

Paradigmatic Influence on Education 63

Curriculum 67

Effects of Education 71

The State of Education 72

Part III. Conpromise and Modernity, 1939-1970

VI. Authoritarianism and Development, 1939-1969 75

Paradigmatic Influence on Education 77

Educational Aims 78

Curriculum 80

Effects of Education 85

State of Education 86

VII. The Education Act of 1970 89

Paradigmatic Influence on Education 89

Educational Aims 89

Curriculum 92

State of Education 93

VIII. Conclusion 95

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Future 97

Further Remarks on Paradigms 98

Concluding Remarks 99

Bibliography 101

Appendix I. Financial Aspects of Education, 1964 106

Appendix II. Average Manpower Needs and Potential Resources of the Educational System, 1967-1971 107

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	Recommendations of the Education Commission of the Cortes of Cadiz (1813)	27
II	Curriculum of the Free Institute of Teaching	49
III	A Sample of the Higher Education Curriculum Inspired by the Efforts of the Junta	68
IV	A Sample of the Subjects Taught at the Spanish International School	70
V	Faculties of a Full University	81
VI	Curriculum of General Secondary Education	83
VII	Curriculum of Elementary Education	84

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Educational systems generally reflect the influence of the ruling classes' view of reality because the ruling classes impose their view of reality upon society. Because of this, Spanish educational history will be examined developmentally in relation to changing views of reality as a result of changing ruling classes.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this thesis is the examination of the relationship between education, ruling classes, and views of reality.

Education is essentially a transmission, from one generation to the next, of a body of knowledge held in importance by society.[1] The importance of this body of knowledge is generally determined by the social and institutional make-up of the society. This make-up is greatly influenced by those who have power so that education can, for the most part, serve their interests. These interests are served by the imposition of particular value, knowledge, and reality interpretations upon the educational system which is manifest in the ethos, structure, and curriculum of the educational system. A particular model of education thus arises. Consequently, the model of education is usually an indicator of the type of class in power because different ruling

classes usually impose different ethoses, structures, and curricula. A shift in the class in power, therefore, usually results in a shift in the educational model.[2]

In order to examine the relationship between education, ruling classes, and views of reality, the Garfinklian hypotheses are used.

Research Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. A paradigm is a model for explaining reality which is derived from the scientific discipline concerned as wellas from the view of reality of the ruling classes.

A paradigm, according to Thomas Kuhn,[3] is a pattern (i.e. a model) that is accepted by a group of practitioners in a discipline for the interpretation and extrapolation of information relating to the discipline.[4] Gradually, there is an accumulation of information which cannot be accounted for and explained by the prevailing pattern. This eventually leads to a paradigmatic shift to a new pattern capable of explaining both the new information and the information adequately explained by the old pattern. This process goes on indefinitely.

Harry Garfinkle[5] accepts Kuhn's basic idea but claims that the paradigm (i.e. the pattern) is in the world-view of the ruling classes of society as well as in the discipline (i.e. in the accumulation of unexplained information). Garfinkle comes to this conclusion because Kuhn fails to take into consideration the political uses of knowledge. In other words, knowledge may be used to benefit some people

at the expense of others, or neglect of others.

The Garfinklian paradigm is then seen as a class influenced pattern of interpretating reality which is imposed upon society and its institutions for the purpose of maintaining the ruling class in power. The paradigm changes when the ruling class changes.[6] The new pattern which is imposed does not affect all areas of knowledge to the same degree because of the different natures of the areas of knowledge.[7] As a result, each discipline has its subparadigm. The subparadigms tend to become as like the paradigm as the nature of the discipline allows so that the discipline can use with greater facility an interdisciplinary approach (which in today's increasingly more complex state of knowledge is very useful).

Hypothesis 2. The paradigmatic level of the ruling class affects the economic system; historically, paradigms are connected to the rise and expansion of capitalism.

Hypothesis 3. The connection between paradigms and capitalism can be examined through the elements of the paradigm as revealed in the axiology (the theory of values), the epistemology (the theory of knowledge), and the ontology (the theory of reality).

Paradigms are connected to the rise and expansion of capitalism. The reason for this is that the paradigm is a pattern that uses scientific knowledge.[8] Scientific knowledge arose because of the disintegration of the medieval view of

reality and to meet the needle and demands of capitalism.[9] In a period of five centuries (fifteenth to twentieth), the West has seen a sequence of three paradigms.

The first paradigm originated in Italy during the fifteenth century and lasted into the seventeenth century.[10] From Italy it spread to other European countries, principally in northwestern Europe.[11] Socially, its ties were to the alliance between Princes and merchants which had destroyed the power of the feudal nobility. Politically, it was at the mercy of the Princes who had now attained absolute or near absolute power. Economically, it was linked to the rich merchants who were politically powerless or nearly so.[12] The economic system that arose during this period was mercantile capitalism. The first paradigm then, was linked to mercantile capitalism.

These conditions gave rise to the elements of paradigm one. The axiology stressed the importance of individualism. The axiology originated in the influence of humanism which harkened back to the individualism and "liberty" of antiquity, and from the Reformation which exulted the individual over the intermediaries in religion. These things were favoured by the alliance of Princes and merchants because it freed both of them from many of the restraints of medieval times which were encumbant upon their professions. The epistemology restricted reliable knowledge of the material world to sense data usually. The epistemology was the result of an axiology which decried medieval authority but put a bar on an investigation of basic Christian

premises.[13] The epistemology was supported by both Princes and merchants for the same reasons given for their support of the axiology. The ontology viewed the material world as composed of simple, indivisible "substances" called monads. The ontology was the product of an axiology which emphasized individualism, and an epistemology which emphasized sense data. The ontology was supported by both Princes and merchants because it gave a chance for them to use reason without being hampered as much by tradition as they had been before. This resulted in greater political control and greater financial profits. The elements of the first paradigms were: (1) individualism, (2) material sensibility, and (3) monadology.[14]

The paradigm one science that emerged from the influence of the above theoretical elements was concerned with the collection and classification of observable data. What was observed was distinct from the observer, therefore, the context of the phenomena was not important. Lastly, the investigations of science were restricted to the material sphere of reality because paradigm one science recognized the existance of a non-material reality which was outside its province.

The second paradigm came into being primarily in northwestern Europe because the greater economic prosperity and relatively less repressive atmosphere[15] stimulated scientific inquiry. It was the result of the frustration felt by the middle classes[16] at the sovereign's control of the economy through the granting of monopolies and li-

censes and their own impotence to change the political situation to one more favourable to business. The logical result was the overthrow of the monarchy[17] and the establishment of a republic.[18] Politically, the second paradigm was against "divine" institutions and in favour of more rational institutions that would guarantee a good environment for business.[19] Socially, the upholders of the second paradigm were the middle classes composed of the rich merchants and other entrepreneurs. Economically, the second paradigm was linked to the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution and industrial capitalism.

From the above conditions, the elements of the second paradigm were formed. The axiology gave importance to the feeling of bourgeois nationalism.[20] The nationalism originated in the troubled political conditions of the times.[21] The new ruling classes succeeded in persuading the nation (an easier task during troubled than in peaceful times) that its political and social gains were the same as the nation's. The epistemology extended the scientific reliability of knowledge further into zones formerly considered outside the province of science. This was favoured by the new ruling middle classes as the only basis for their continued rule of society[22] because the more traditional supports, such as the Church, were either actively hostile or lukewarmly receptive to middle class control.[23] The epistemology was derived from an axiology which emphasized the national collectivity (and the problems of its control and management) instead of individualism. The ontology declared reality to be

a process of exchange which resulted in a balance. The ontology was the result of an epistemology based on the extension of the scientific reliability of knowledge and the axiology of nationalism. The elements of the second paradigm were: (1) nationalism, (2) greater extension of the scientific reliability of knowledge,[25] and (3) the process of exchange which resulted in a balance.

The paradigm two science that resulted was concerned with the processes of exchange and equilibrium.[26] What was observed was no longer completely distinct from the observer. The non-material component of reality was no longer as important as the material. An increasing share of what was knowledge was defined by science. Naturally, there was increasing conflict between non-scientific, especially religion, and scientific knowledge.

The third paradigm originated in nineteenth century northwestern Europe.[27] From there it has spread to the United States. Politically, its ties were with the new ruling class of the haute bourgeoisie- the bourgeoisie having split into a petty and haute section in the early nineteenth century.[28] It was economically influenced by the extension of capitalism's concern from the nation to the world.[29] Its social ties were to the haute bourgeoisie although its beneficial influence was spread to many more classes.[30] The third paradigm then, was linked to monopoly-finance capitalism .

These conditions determined the elements of paradigm three. The axiology declared that it was concerned with

the welfare and prosperity of the planet and all its inhabitants. This axiology was derived from the need of capitalism to acquire cheaper raw materials through the extension of their direct control.[31] The epistemology was concerned with the complete extension of the scientific reliability of knowledge into all spheres of reality and combined this with a historical, developmental view.[32] This was derived from the globalism of the axiology which equated national exploitation with development. This epistemology was favoured as a means to stop working class cries of exploitation.[33] The ontology saw reality in terms of it being the same for everyone, or at least capable of being the same for everyone.[34] This ontology was the result of the globalism and historical development because the globalism supplied the values necessary for everyone to think or at least to aspire to the same things, and the historical development equated this aspiration with the logical progression of all human development.[35] The effect of the ontology was to socialize people into the ruling classes' point of view, which had the effect of channeling complaints away from the fault of the system to the fault of the individual.[36] The elements of the third paradigm- the general paradigm existing among the developed countries today- are: (1) globalism, (2) historical development, and (3) the sameness of culture.

Paradigm three science is concerned with global systems and their development through time. These systems are concerned with improving the world picture but they do not necessarily increase the knowledge of the world.[37] Paradigm

three science is essentially concerned with the refinement of present knowledge instead of earnestly questioning premises and objectives.[38]

The paradigms have a great influence on the sciences but they also have an influence on other aspects of civilization, including education.

Hypothesis 4. Paradigms affect the educational system by being used to bring it more in line with the views of the ruling class.

The effect of the first paradigm on education was beneficial. The axiology spurred the expansion of the educational system.[39] The epistemology gave impetus to the study of the sciences at the universities.[40] The ontology resulted in the maintenance of a link between the medieval and modern world view in this period of rapid change in the educational system.[41]

The result of the paradigmatic influence was the partial independence of education from medieval authority. It was partial because the medieval curriculum could be adapted to meet the needs and beliefs of the Princes and the merchants. Thus, in addition to the study of Religion, Grammar, and Arithmetic, there was the study of politics and gentlemanly behaviour.[42] Education became an important concern after many years of neglect.[43]

The effect of the second paradigm on education was an acceleration of the processes set in motion during the first paradigm. The axiology spurred a greater expansion of the educational system, especially to the lower classes.[44]

The epistemology led to a greater development of the sciences and other disciplines; all were put under a more systematic basis.[45] The ontology resulted in a lopsided development of the educational system which did not benefit the poor.[46]

The result of the paradigmatic influence was a further bifurcation of education. The poor got one type of education; the rich another. Education was not a means of social mobility.[47] The effect of the educational system was a reinforcement of the political and economic subjection of the lower classes.

The effect of the third paradigm on education was the culimination of the processes set in motion by paradigm one and strengthened by paradigm two. The axiology spurred the extension of education by making it compulsory and by trying to spread it to the rest of the world.[48] The epistemology led to an even greater emphasis on the development of science in higher education with interesting results.[49] The ontology led to the rapid expansion of the same educational system throughout the nation and the world in general.[50]

The result of the paradigmatic influence upon education has been a tremendous increase in the literacy rate of the world and the adoption of a new world view by many non-western peoples. It has also made education an agent of political control in both East and West.[51]

The three paradigms show the influence exerted by the ruling classes upon science and upon the educational

system. This influence has generally been, for education, one of extending it until it finally becomes compulsory. Along with this extension of education has been an increase in social mobility and economic development. Along with these benefits, there must also be counted the use of education for the maintenance of a particular socio-economic system as the only just system.

Hypothesis 5. When a new class (proletariat) challenges the the bourgeois view of knowledge, they (the proletariat) develops its own axiology (socialism), epistemology (praxis), and ontology (historical materialism). Changes in this challenge position will be identified as "apothegm" shifts.

Limits of Paradigmatic Analysis

Paradigms show the interconnection between education, ruling classes, and the prevailing views of reality. The thesis, however, does not exclude the influence of other factors in society other than the ruling class. It therefore, cannot give an exhaustive analysis of an educational system and the influences working upon it. But what it does do is to support the claim that the ruling class has a prepoderant influence upon the educational system.

[1]See R. S. Peters', Ethics and Education (London, George Allen & Unwin Ltd., 1966), p. 45.

[2]A shift in the educational model can, of course, be the result of factors other than ruling class shifts.

[3]Thomas Kuhn, The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1970), passim.

[4]For the necessity of a model in science, see Thomas Kuhn, pp. 111-135.

[5]Professor Garfinkle of the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta has not yet published his theory of paradigms.

[6]Paradigmatic change can, of course, be the result of an accumulation of unexplained information.

[7]Political science, for eg., will have little in common with chemistry.

[8]In the middle ages, the pattern was not a paradigm, and used a principally theologically dominated philosophical knowledge (eg. Scholasticism).

[9]The need to find another route to the East after the Capture of Constantinople in 1453 gave a great impetus to the development of the science of navigation by the Portuguese; there was a need for a better knowledge of the seas to decrease losses that might be ruinous.

[10]Dates are necessarily vague because paradigms exist in a continuum- between paradigms there exists a number of transitional paradigms- consequently one cannot say the precise year in which one paradigm begins and another ends.

[11]The countries of northwestern Europe, principally

England, had the benefit of receiving the liberating effect of humanism together with the liberating effect of Protestantism which resulted in the greater acceptance, generally speaking, of new ideas. In Italy and Spain science was always running into trouble with the Inquisition, witness Galileo.

[12]The case of the Medici illustrates this very nicely. Shortly after attaining power, they,within the space of a century after becoming prominent in public life, became absolute rulers who deprived the other merchant families of Florence of any say in the political affairs of their city.

[13]The sciences could not deal with any aspect of Christianity because the scientists were firmly committed to their Christian beliefs as were their patrons. Newton, for eg., wrote as much about the Apocalypse as he did about Physics.

[14]Monad was introduced as a concept by Leibnitz in the seventeenth century.

[15]The Inquisition had no counterpart north of the Alps for reasons already mentioned. Moreover, this region had become very prosperous while the Iberian peninsula and Italy languished, generally speaking.

[16]The government had tight control on all economic matters. Patronage was an important aspect of business. The usefulness of a certain economic enterprise was no guarantee that it would be licensed by the government. Competition did not exist to any great extent- monopolies were very frequent, witness the establishment of the Hud-

son Bay Company and the monopoly given to it.

[17]The English avoided this by curbing the power of the king to such an extent that the members of Parliament became the rulers of the country. The king became largely a figurehead.

[18]France, on the other hand, was never able to institute a constitutional monarchy, with the result that the friction between the middle classes and the government was never eased.

[19]Mercantile capitalism had outrun its usefulness in a society in which the massive production of the incipient Industrial Revolution could more efficiently be distributed, and more profitably, through free trade, the advantages of which were outlined by Adam Smith in his book, The Wealth of Nations. The monarchy stood for the continuance of mercantile capitalism.

[20]Nationalism became important as a means of rallying the support of the majority of the population for the new government as in the 1790's in revolutionary France.

[21]By focusing on collective problems, personal grievances can be shelved. Thus the political emancipation promised by the French revolutionaries failed to materialize under the Directory.

[22]The middle classes could base their right to rule only on the grounds of being more efficient and just than the previous regime, since supernatural grounds had been abolished in their destruction of the divine right of kings (the sovereignty residing in the people). The only way they

could realize this would be to use a more scientific approach to understanding the nation, hence the beginning of modern census taking at the very beginning of the nineteenth century for both France and Britain.

[23]The Church was usually not receptive to the changes because they, i.e. the middle classes, took away much of their priviledged position in society, especially in France where many of the revolutionaries tended to be atheists, agnostics, or deists.

[24]Nationalism came to dominate much of the thinking of those times and individualism was less of a force, even though the slogans were about the Rights of Man, and Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity.

[25]The domain of scientific rationality was expanding at the expense of faith so that by the late eighteenth century, the traditional proofs of God's existence were not standing up to scientific advances, hence Emmanuel Kant's rescue attempt.

[26]The paradigm two scientific discipline which most clearly showed the influence of the second paradigm was organic chemistry with its exchange of nutrients between and within the cells keeping the organism alive.

[27]The third paradigm originated in northwestern Europe because there the development had gone far enough in terms of industrial development that the nation no longer provided sufficient stimulus for industry. Thus, these countries (Britain, France, and Germany,principally) scrambled for African and Asian colonies.

[28]The reason for this split was that the increasing sophistication of the machinery needed for the expanding industrial development meant that the capitalization required was more than could be supplied by the average entrepreneur- only the wealthiest members could afford the capitalization required; these became the haute bourgeoisie, the captains of industry.

[29]Capitalism needed the resources of the entire planet to work efficiently, hence the development of the multinationals and cartels; efficiency was better than competition because it was less costly.

[30]The material benefits of the world-embracing (except for Communist countries) capitalism have reached down to a great many people throughout the world.

[31]Colonies were the least costly way of obtaining the raw materials needed.

[32]Capitalism is held to be the natural culmination of any societal development.

[33]It was during the birth of the third paradigm that the working class became conscientized enough by the disruption of the Industrial Revolution to question the premise of the middle classes' control namely, that middle class control was not for the benefit of all in society.

[34]The slogan was that capitalism gave everyone, who put his mind to it, equality of opportunity.

[35]All societies had to go through the same experiences as the West in order to modernize- only the West could provide the way to develop.

[36]By doing this, the system removes potential hostility towards it.

[37]Many technological developments are retarded simply because the big corporations have other interests that they want to use up first before employing the new technology which otherwise might lead to the loss of profits of the old technology.

[38]Paradigm three science is not concerned with improving the way science is put to use, witness the atomic bomb; it is concerned with a non-political use of knowledge.

[39]Aristocrats became more interested in education as a certain amount of education became a necessity for a gentleman.

[40]The universities of England became centres for the study of Physics.

[41]Religion remained an important subject in all phases of education, including higher education.

[42]Two of the most popular books of the time were Machiavelli's, The Prince and Castiglione's The Courtier.

[43]Education of the nobility was held to be a necessity because of the functions they performed for the Prince who needed to run his realm in a more efficient way.

[44]During the eighteenth century, the Sunday school was founded and monitorial instruction began to be used in order to teach the essentials to the largest number of people for the least cost.

[45]Chemistry was put in a more systematic fashion as was philosophy (eg. Hegelianism), and history.

[46]All major development in terms of knowledge was concentrated in higher education, whereas lower education was left in the hands of the Church with little or no influence from the government, even in Napoleonic France.

[47]The education of the poor, being concerned solely with the three R's did not provide them with the skills necessary to improve their station in life.

[48]A capitalistic using the whole planet as its market requires an educated work force throughout the planet.

[49]Some science departments at some American universities such as Berkeley receive inordinate amounts of money because they are directly tied in to industry demands. The idea of the university as an institution that is a centre of all knowledge and free from outside interference receives a crude shock.

[50]Development is equated to the setting up of the educational systems present in the West.

[51]Both communist and non-communist countries use education as a means of making the population accept their ideologies.

Part I

CONFLICT AND CONTROL, 1812-1868

The period from 1812 to 1868 witnessed the partial elite transition in Spanish society from the predominant influence of a preparadigmatic world view to that of the first paradigm.[1] This resulted in conflict and controversy between traditionalists and modernists. Spanish society began very slowly to modernize.

Chapter II

MODERNITY AND TRADITION, 1812-1834

Spanish society was unstable during the years between 1812 and 1834 because of the failure of the traditional leaders of Spanish life, the Church and the Monarchy, to come to terms with the new reality of a world order forever changed by the French Revolution. The differences separating traditional Spain from modern Spain became sharper.[2]

Politically, this period of twenty-two years was very turbulent- no less than four change of governments occured. Between 1810 and 1814, Spain was a Constitutional Monarchy ruled by a Liberal Parliament from Cadiz (the only part of Spain free of French soldiers). The king of Spain, Fernando VII, was a hostage of Napoleon at the time, and so he had no political input into the political ideas realized in Cadiz. Consequently, the Restoration of 1814 was bound to create problems for the Liberal government. This is exactly what happened. The greater part of the influential opinion

in the country was against the idea of a liberal Spain.[3] This played into the hands of the king who was a thorough absolutist. The result was that absolutism became supreme once again in Spain between the years 1814 and 1820. During this time, Liberals were persecuted, and all the rights of the Church were restored. Dissatisfaction with the status quo existed not only among the Liberals but also among many army officers who owed their present status to promotions made during the Liberal regime. As a result, they supported the revolt against the government in 1820 which was successful. The new Liberal regime put into effect all the measures enacted during the previous Liberal administration such as expropriation of Church lands, making the monarchy constitutional, abolishment of the Inquisition, etc. This was the work of a minority of individuals who happened to have the military on their side- the majority of the population was still against Liberal ideas. The king bided his time.[4] France, now a bastion of conservatism, came to the rescue of the Absolutist cause in Spain by invading the country in 1823. The population welcomed the French army where only ten years before they had been fighting them. The reason for this was that the earlier French invasion was aimed at conquest of the country and so aroused deep hostility in the proud Spanish nation. The invasion of 1823 was aimed at restoring the Spanish government to its traditional form, and with this sentiment the majority of the population agreed. The three years of Liberal rule showed that the continued existance of the old order was precarious.

This knowledge goes far to explain the wave of repression which followed the successful reimposition of Absolutism in 1823- the idea of Liberalism that sovereignty rested in the people and not the king had to be suppressed. Under the protection of the French army of occupation (1823-1828), Fernando VII firmly reestablished his absolute control of the government- it was a time of frustrated Liberal hopes.

During these years, the economic and social make-up of the society suffered some hard jolts. The noble classes were compromised by their support of the French invaders or by their lukewarm support of the resistance to the French. Consequently, this was the last period of Spanish history in which the nobility maintained a dominating influence in all matters. At the same time, the economic situation deteriorated. The country had been devastated for five years (1808-1813) by French, Allied, and Guerilla armies; the Spanish colonies in mainland North and South America successfully maintained their newly won independence despite efforts by the Spaniards to regain them. The loss of most of the empire by 1825 was a severe blow to an economy which had been used to a captive market for its goods for more than three hundred years. The old order in Spain was rapidly losing the reason for its existence since it could not regain the empire (which most Spanish Liberals did not want to lose) and it was not secure at home (without French help, Fernando could not have remained an Absolutist).

Paradigmatic Influence

Between the years 1812 and 1834, Spanish society was subject to the influence of competing patterns of interpreting reality. The more advanced western European world perspective, in the form of the French reforms of Joseph Bonaparte, intruded into Spanish life too quickly for it to become adapted to Spanish conditions. As a result, it was rejected by the majority of the population who continued to be under the preparadigmatic influence of the Catholic Church.

The influence of the preparadigmatic world view, with its disdain for the claims of modern science, originated in religion and in the folklore of the lower classes. It entailed the hallowing of tradition and the condemnation of much that was innovative. The view of reality of this pattern was that this world was inherently bad and that only in the next world would matters be truly happy. Consequently, the matter of changing the material conditions of the world had a low priority in life. The political result of the preparadigmatic outlook, was the continued vitality of the absolutist ideal among the greater part of the population and the continuing power of the Church. The social effects of the preparadigmatic approach was the failure to conscientize the lower classes into becoming active in their own amelioration.[5] Economically, the preparadigmatic approach was responsible for the maintenance of a non-capitalistic work ethic and the consequent slow growth of the economy.[6] This followed from the emphasis on the other

world, and the failure to look ahead materially. In sum, the preparadigmatic world-view was keeping Spain from realizing her potential; this power had to be reduced before development could take place.

Paradigm one was confined to a small section of the upper and middle classes. Politically, paradigm one was connected with the strengthening of the monarchy at the expense of the nobility and in favour of the mercantile elements in society. The influence of a paradigm one pattern could be detected in the eighteenth century during the reign of the first Bourbons as a result of the influences, albeit late ones, coming from the rest of the developing European world.[7] Unfortunately, Fernando did not share his ancestors' concern for the welfare of his realm.[8] During his reign, enlightened despotism gave way to tyranny. The king was not at all concerned with reforming the nobility because he was confident of their support. So, there was a retreat form the first, or near first, paradigm position achieved in the eighteenth century. The same was true of economic matters. The slow development of the agricultural and manufacturing sectors of the economy during the eighteenth century had been accomplished under the influence of the first paradigm and its supporters' high regard for scientific knowledge about the material world. Fernando had little interest in economic matters and so reconstruction proceeded very slowly. In social matters, paradigm one represented a lessening of the rigidity of the classes and the replacement of aristocratic privilege with merit,

theoretically speaking. A beginning was attempted in the eighteenth century when a conscientious effort was made to choose people more for their ability than for their birth. Under Fernando, however, all that counted was personal loyalty,[9] hence the brevity of his ministers' terms in office and their general incompetence. This was a retreat from any sense of the paradigm one position of his ancestors.

Paradigm one then, had little influence from 1812 to 1834.

Paradigm two was confined to the even smaller group who had given birth to Liberalism with the establishment of the Cortes of Cadiz in 1810. Paradigm two exulted the concept of the nation over that of the individual or the monarchy. It was concerned with the establishment of the rights of the "people" from whom all power flowed. This concept of political power as residing in the people instead of in the person of the king put its proponents squarely against most of the beliefs of Spanish society,[10] and it became one of the most important reasons for their downfall. Fernando completely rejected this concept (borrowed from the French), and he mostly had the support of the people.[11] The direct political influence of paradigm two was completely defeated during this period. Economically, paradigm two favoured the rise of industrial capitalism and was associated with the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution. These economic ideas were not represented in the first Spanish Liberals- they still thought mostly in terms of the old mercantilist theory.[12] Economically then,

they were still in paradigm one- the economic influence of paradigm two was negligible in terms of developing a strong industrial economy.[13] In terms of social make-up, the paradigm two position favoured the middle classes as the source of all power (under the rubric of Democracy), and manufacturing wealth as the basis of social standing instead of titled rank, or landed or commercial wealth. Here too, the Liberals were not up to paradigm two. They were more in the tradition of paradigm one and one half of the English, whereby the monarchy is not abolished but does become constitutional, and the aristocracy is not overthrown but its privileges are reduced and there is an attempt to integrate them with the newly powerful middle classes. Spanish society would not have been fundamentally altered[14] by the Liberals had they even been successful, because for this to have happened, it would have required the dominant influence of at least paradigm two which, as we have seen, did not have a good hold on these first Liberals.

In general, these various preparadigmatic and incipient paradigmatic influences served only to complicate Spain's recovery from the Napoleonic Wars and from the loss of most of her empire- it made her entry into the modern world a slow affair. Also it deepened the rifts in Spanish society between those who wanted to innovate and those who did not.

Education

Education during the period under discussion was influenced only maeginally by the two paradigms- it remained essentially preparadigmatic. Only during the two brief

periods of Liberal rule (1810-1814 and 1820-1823) was a modern idea of what education should be entertained;[15] during the Fernandine period, education suffered from governmental indifference.[16]

The first Liberals were influenced by the second paradigm (though not predominantly so). This was especially true with regard to education. Paradigm two envisaged a massive extension of education to include the lower classes[17] and the introduction of the sciences as part of the regular curriculum of secondary education. The French had seen the need for such an educational system early in the Revolution- the Liberals, however, lacked the vision to come up with a system of education that would be modern and at the same time take cognisance of the traditions of the country; instead they simply adopted the French model. The educational recommendations of a Commission of the Cortes of Cadiz (1813) betrayed their origin quite glaringly.[18] Among the provisions of the Commission were: (1) state-controlled, universal, primary education, and (2) state-controlled higher education.[19] The specific recommendations, about thirteen in all (see table one), reveal the belief of the commission in the importance of education as a means of "catching up" with the rest of the advanced nations of Europe.[20] Needless to say the implementation and continuation of such proposals required that the general society be dominated by paradigm two concerns or close to paradigm two concerns-[21] Spain was far from meeting these requirements,[22] so the recommendations remained words on paper only during

TABLE ONE

Recommendations of the Education Commission of the Cortes of Cadiz (1813)

- Uniformity in underlying principles
- Uniformity in curricula
- Uniformity in methods
- Uniformity in language
- Uniformity in the centralization of funds
- Parents and teachers have the right to select teachers and schools
- Condemnation of special privilege or monopoly in educational matters
- Competition between private and national education
- Establishment of a Directory General of Studies
- Fusion of various learned bodies into one National Academy which would act as an advisory agency in educational matters
- Prospective teachers to come to Madrid to pass competitive examinations in the Central University
- Establishment of provincial universities to reorganize former schools of Humanities and Philosophy faculties
- Curriculum to aim at general culture and general preparation for higher studies

---

Information taken from J. R. Perz', Secondary Education in Spain (Catholic University of America, 1934), p. 45.

the brief tenures in office of the first Liberals. As a result, higher education remained at the paradigm one level to which it had been raised in the eighteenth century, while secondary and primary education remained preparadigmatic.[23]

The Fernandine restoration resulted in the condemnation of Liberal ideas.[24] In education, this meant the return of the teaching orders and heavy government censorship. Under Fernando VII, education languished because of governmental indifference and sometimes, hostility.[25] The king did not want to extend education as a means of controlling the population and developing the country because he feared all new ideas that might in any way lead to the diminuation of his absolute power.[26] The result was a partial retreat from the paradigm one position in the later years of his rule. Consequently, it would not be an exaggeration to say that education at the time of his death in 1833 was generally below the level of the 1780's.[27]

State of Education

Education during these twenty-two years suffered from the conflict between the various paradigms as reflected in the power struggles of the time. During the brief periods of Liberal rule, educational thought was influenced by paradigm one and important traces of paradigm two. This quickly reverted to paradigm one during the Fernandine restoration, and then fell a bit short of the first paradigm during the latter part of Fernando's rule. Is it any wonder then, that education actually declined during this period.

[1]The elite were beginning to see the world more in the rationalist sense than previously before.

[2]The differences were medievalism and lack of tolerance as opposed to rationalism and limited tolerance.

[3]See R. Carr (Oxford, 1966), p. 117.

[4]Ibid., p. 142.

[5]The lower classes tended to accept the traditional scheme of things.

[6]Work was not considered an honourable way to become successful; militarism was the way.

[7]The monk Feijoo translated many scientific works and popularized the sciences despite Church opposition.

[8]See R. L. Kagan's, Students and Society in Early Modern Spain (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), p. 47.

[9]See S. G. Payne's, Spain and Portugal, vol. two (The University of Wisconsin Press, 1973), p. 435.

[10] The common belief was that power was delegated to the king by God; the king received advice from his ministers.

[11]See S. G. Payne's, Spain and Portugal, p. 428.

[12]Because they had not had any experience with industrialism of the eighteenth century English variety.

[13]The development of the Spanish economy demanded time and effort, it could not be done through a fiat of the Liberals.

[14]The Liberals were not radicals; they did not envisage the abolishment of landowning, the Church, or the Crown.

[15]Modern in the sense of being adapted to the economic needs of the nation.

[16]The king was primarily interested in maintaining

his absolute rule.

[17]The lower classes had to be controlled and educated into good workers.

[18]They were an exact copy of those devised by Condorcet for the French educational system in 1791.

[19]W. W. Brickman, Educational Renewal and Reform in Contemporary Spain (Washington, 1972), p. 5

[20]Education was seen as a means of development.

[21]The population has to be receptive to change.

[22]Spain was still dominated by preparadigms.

[23]Primary and secondary education remained in the hands of the teaching orders.

[24]Fernando believed only in Absolutism.

[25]The universities were closed from 1830-1833.

[26]See S. G. Payne, p. 435.

[27]Ibid., p. 365. The sale of Church lands took away the support of many clerically run village schools which then had to close.

Chapter III

DEVELOPMENT AND NEGLECT, 1834-1868

The period from 1834 to 1868 witnessed a concerted effort by the national government to improve education.[1] At the same time, paradigm one became dominant.

Paradigmatic Influence

Liberalism was established and consolidated during this period of theirty-four years. The Liberals were established by Royal decree[2] as a means of counterbalancing the influence of Carlism,[3] which had started a rebellion against the government of Maria Christina.[4] The Carlists were defeated in 1840 after seven years of civil war. For the remainder of the period, Liberalism was secure enough to indulge in the luxury of factional rivalry.

Politically, the beliefs of the Liberals centered on the sovereignty of the nation- a vague enough term to cover rule by a wide assortment of classes. Deriving from this sovereignty concept (and influenced by foreign economic competition) was the belief in progress.[5] Consequently, the Liberals established a constitutional monarchy and advocated economic development through free trade.

The social basis of Liberalism was heterogeneous. Their common claim was that they were enlightened.

> " The enlightened were not a class, but, as the phrase always ran, classes. Against the attempt to force Spain into the past there was an overall identity of interest between aristocrats, landowners, manufacturers, artisans, 'factory' workers, lawyers, "

" soldiers, and journalists. "[6]

These various social classes did not want a return to Absolutism and the consequent uncertainty over the control of personal destiny- financially and politically.[7]

Economically, Liberalism resulted in a massive transfer of property from the communal lands around the cities and the Church lands into private hands.[8] Since only the financially well off could afford to buy large amounts of land, this meant that the vast majority of the lands were owned by a small number of people.[9] The Liberals were successful in developing a semi-modern manufacturing industry in Catalonia, but this industry suffered from chronic undercapitalization due to the lack of sufficient capital in underdeveloped Spain, and to the disinterest of many Liberals.[10]

The dominant axiology of Spanish society was aristocratic,[11] and was also sentitive to the importance of the individual.[12] The epistemology relied on the scientific reliability of knowledge but put limits on its applicability. The ontology was a mixture of mechanical and spiritual realities. The elements of the paradigm in force at this time were those of the first paradigm, even though the political situation was at a paradigm two or at least one and one half level.[13] Needless to say, the majority of the population remained essentially preparadigmatic.[14]

Education

The impact of paradigm one on education was predictably, an attempt to expand the school system, which was

largely unsuccessful. This was done in order to make Spain a more modern nation.[15] There was an attempt to rid the universities of medieval influences and substitute humanistic and scientific ones- this was fairly successful.[16] The education failed to penetrate most of the population.

Educational Aims

The general aim of education was the modernization of the country by which was meant bringing Spain to the same social, political, and economical level of the most advanced European nations such as Great Britain and France. This was done more as an imitation of more advanced countries than as a result of reasoned thinking on the possibilities and limits of the Spanish situation. The political aims of education were reactionary in that they wanted development but did not want an informed and critical lower class who would want true agricultural reform (a prerequisite for development) and more say in the running of the country. The aim of higher education was to provide an education, secular and sometimes scientific, for the ruling elites. Since literacy was a prerequisite of political office and since most peasants could not afford to lose the labour provided by a son by sending him to study away from home, the political dominance of the country by the elites was assured. To make sure of this, higher education had to be put under direct government control.[17]

> " The universities- of whom the first rectors were the civil governors 'wearing spurs' ... were state controlled; the Central University of Madrid became the sole factory of "

> " higher degrees; professors were put on a uniform pay scale, their appointments standardized... " [18]

Secondary education had the same political aim as higher education. Elementary education had the political aim of keeping the lower classes apolitical.[19] Consequently, the lower classes were not lifted out of their ignorance. The aim of the various levels of education was the maintenance of the status quo.

The social aims of education were also reactionary.[20] Higher education insured the continued domination of society by a small group of people by turning out people who had a more modern world-view than the majority of the people.[21] Secondary education by its emphasis on the classics made it possible for the graduates to go into socially acceptable positions.[22] The elementary education had the effect of keeping the lower classes in ignorance of ideas and techniques that would pose a challenge to upper class rule.[23] The social aim of education was the preservation of a stratified society.

The economic aims of education were developmental and exploitative. Higher education was geared to a humanistic and scientific curriculum. From the sciences there was supposed to emerge a host of engineers, doctors, etc., who would modernize the country.[24] Secondary education had the same economic aims as higher education. The economic aim of elementary education was the continued acceptance of the status quo by the poor, therefore the importance of teaching Christianity and sticking to the basics.[25]

The general aims of education were the result of the political and social changes that had taken place.[26] The general thrust of these aims was economic development and social reactionarism.

Curriculum

The curricula was influenced by the elements of paradigm one. It had the effect of separating the lower classes from the "enlightened" ones.

The curriculum of the universities was humanistic and scientific. This followed from the first paradigm's emphasis on reliable knowledge and its recognition of the importance of other interpretations of reality.

The curriculum of secondary education was somewhat improved by the director of public education, Gil Zarate, in the 1840's, with the introduction of practical subjects.[27] This was once again derived from the first paradigm's concern for reliable knowledge.

The curricular stagnation of elementary education continued because the ruling classes found it expedient.[28] In fact, there was an attempt in the early forties to introduce the monitorial system[29] of mass education, but this failed because of the lack of sufficient attention on the part of the influential classes.[30] Another attempt was made in 1857 with the Moyano Law which called for compulsory school attendance for children between the ages of six and twelve, free education for the poor, establishment of normal schools at the provincial level, and establishment of boards of education at the local and provincial level.[31]

All of these things are part of a second and third paradigm view of reality but, unfortunately, Spanish society was not paradigmatically advanced enough to try to realize these ideas.[32]

The curricula of the educational system separated the classes of Spain from a common point of view.[33] It thus failed to provide an opportunity for social and economic mobility, and also deprived Spain of the talents of its expanding population.[34] Consequently, Liberalism failed to widen its support.

Effects of Education

Education was supposed to modernize the country and stabilize the social system. Ultimately it failed to do both, but in the period being discussed, it was believed that it could do both.

The political effects of higher education were the continuance of upper class rule and the maintenance of the aristocratic tenor of society. Secondary education had the same effect. Elementary education had the political effect, ultimately, of radicalizing many in the lower class (especially in the cities) because the benefits of education were not being realized.[35]

The social effect of higher education was conservatism in the upper class of society. The same was true of secondary education- this made for a generally conservative middle class. The social effects of elementary education were conservatism in the more prosperous peasantry, and hatred of the ruling classes in the destitute lower classes,

especially in the cities.[36]

The economic effects of higher education were exploitative. The same upper class reproduced itself into the same economically dominating positions. The secondary education was nearly the same. The elementary education was conductive to staying in one's economic niche, no matter how bad conditions were.[37]

The effects of education were those to be expected in a society strongly dominated by paradigm one and preparadigmatic humanism and theology. Education was for the benefit of only one class in the society (the ruling class) and was strongly humanistic and religious in content. The same situation occured in the sixteenth century when the first paradigm was flourishing elsewhere in Europe. Nineteenth century Spain was lagging far behind most of the advanced European nations who were already in the second or third paradigm. In fact, Spain could be said to be even more behind than the advanced European nations of the sixteenth century because of the nearly total lack of scientific development beyond the teaching of the already known. Yet Spain was not immune to the influences of other nations, and this made for the continued polarization of society, which education increased.

State of Education

Education advanced at the higher level during the period from 1834 to 1868. The educational system was dominated by preparadigms and the first paradigm.[38]

The aims of education had the effect of continuing

the status quo because it was not aimed at enlightening but merely at learning "facts" and information. The curricula[39] kept the majority of the population in a safe ignorance. The effect of both the aims and the curricula was the increased polarization of society.

The period from 1812 to 1868 witnessed the firm implantation of a paradigm one view of reality for the professional elite. Preparadigms, however, continued to be important. As a result, education began slowly to change and take on a more modern appearance.[40]

[1]The University legislation in the 1840's and the Moyano Law of 1857 proved this.

[2]The Royal decree was necessary in order to give the Liberals legality in the eyes of the population.

[3]See R. Carr, Spain 1808-1939 (Oxford, 1966), pp. 149-154.

[4]Maria Christina was strongly Liberal in her views.

[5]R. Carr, pp. 196-206.

[6]Ibid. p. 196.

[7]Ibid.,pp. 203, 206.

[8]Ibid., pp. 172, 272-273.

[9]For an account of the land transfer, see R. Carr, p.256.

[10]Ibid., pp. 200-201, 264.

[11]Ibid., p. 204.

[12]The securing of personal liberty and initiative was one of the great boosts of Liberalism.

[13]The establishment of a constituional monarchy was a paradigm one and one half influenced situation.

[14]Because it was mainly composed of a conservative and poor peasantry.

[15]The modern nations of Europe were expanding their educational systems, so the Liberals did likewise.

[16]The clerical influence at the universities was eliminated during the 1840's.

[17]See R. Carr, pp. 236-237.

[18]Ibid., p. 237.

[19]By keeping the curriculum to the bearest necessities, no chance is given the child to learn how to use the few skills he possesses.

[20]They were meant to keep the poor from having an opportunity to be mobile.

[21]Only the well educated could run the country efficiently.

[22]The positions of influence in society were naturally open only to those who had some education and qualification.

[23]They could not better themselves because they did not know how to use the system to their own advantage.

[24]There was thus a very practival bent to the interest of the Liberals in higher education.

[25]Christianity accepted the status quo as long as its place in the national life was not challenged.

[26]The country had become a constitutional monarchy and the new ruling classes were insecure.

[27]The practical courses were aimed at giving the graduates an ability to use their skills at work.

[28]There was never enough money for elementary education in spite of the growing prosperity of the growing country.

[29]W. W. Brickman, Educational Reform and Renewal in Contemporary Spain (Washington, 1972), p. 6.

[30]This lack was in part due to the unstable political conditions prevailing during the early part of Liberal rule.

[31]W. W. Brickman, p.5.

[32]The economic development of Spain was not sufficient to maintain such an educational system.

[33]The upper classes were instructed to see things in a more rationalistic manner, whereas the lower classes were more easily influenced by appeals to the emotions or faith.

[34]Because it was recruting talent from a very small

percentage of the population.

[35]The spread of education was very slow and the result of making the sacrifice of sending a son to have an elementary education was frustrating.

[36]The cities were centres of the radical movement because in them industrialism showed most clearly the exploitative nature of the economic system which was not helped by the educational system.

[37]For those few of the poor who had elementary education, the teachers, almost always clerical, gave a non-thinking for-one-self education.

[38]It was dominated by beliefs in the absolute reliability of Catholicism upon a number of non-religious items.

[39]Because it did not present knowledge that would threaten the status quo.

[40]Education began to be directed more and more towards satisfying the needs of the nation.

Part II

POLARIZATION AND CONFLICT, 1868-1939

Spanish Liberalism reached its climax in the period from 1868 to 1939. It finally triumphed over the Carlist threat. This was, perhaps, its only indisputable success. The failures became greater: failure to develop a true democracy, failure to better the lot of the poor, and failure to mend the widening rifts- ideological and philosophical- in society. The result was the disappearance of compromise, and its tragic consequence, the Civil War which put an end to Liberal Spain.

During the period under discussion, there was a shift from a paradigm one position to a paradigm two perspective, although paradigm one, various preparadigms, and even an apothegm one approach were also strong. It was no wonder compromise disappeared.

Chapter IV

FREEDOM AND CONSERVATISM, 1868-1898

Education became more tolerant and free,[1] principally in higher education. Credit for this moderate change belonged to the Free Institute of Teaching and its guiding light, Francisco Giner. Nevertheless, reactionary forces, chiefly clerical, were instrumental in preventing the spread of toleration and freedom much beyond higher education.

Paradigmatic Influence

Paradigm one was still dominant but other interpreta-

tive patterns of reality became important. Between 1868 and 1873, the Revolutionaries, who had driven out the Bourbon dynasty in 1868, controlled the country. They chose Amadeo of Savoy as the new king. He was a model constitutional monarch failed to control the forces of disintegration, and resigned.[2] A republic was proclaimed by the radical element among the Revolutionaries, but the republic was unable to survive the crises of the Third Carlist War and the Cantonalist rebellions in the south and east of the country.[3] As a result of these various difficulties, the republic lasted only one year (1873). A short period of conservative rule ensued and the Bourbons were recalled the following year (1875). The Carlist War was successfully concluded- the Cantonalist rebellion was crushed before the return of the Bourbons- and never again did Carlism become a potent threat.[4] For the rest of the period (1876-1898), there was political security based on the two-party system of Liberals and Conservatives.

The revolutionaries of 1868 were still dominated by a paradigm one interpretation of reality, although in their encouragement of academic freedom they approached paradigm two and its emphasis on toleration.[5] The same situation applied to the period of the Bourbon restoration except that there was less of an approach to paradigm two.[6] Only during the republic was paradigm two accepted politically; in the areas affected by the Cantonalist rebellion the situation was apothegmatic.[7] The republic was politically paradigm two because for the first time, the Revolutionaries were

doing away with the whole inherited system of monarchical government. The Cantonalist rebels wanted, and implemented proletarian rule in those areas they controlled.[8]

The axiology that emerged under the restoration was more concerned with the individual than the Revolutionaries of 1868.[9] The axiology was derived from the interests supporting the Bourbons, which wanted to diffuse radicalism,[10] and, paradoxically, from the interests of some radical philosophies which put individualism on a pedestal.[11] The epistemology was based on the reliability of scientific knowledge about the material world, and it was beginning to slowly tolerate some extension of this knowledge into the religious domain. This originated in the intellectual class, who were very influential in political life.

> "....The evolution of ideas which led to the establishment of the first republic in 1873 and of the second republic in 1931 was largely due to a group of literary intellectuals."[12]

The ontology was dualistic- matter and spirit are the components of reality. But there was the beginning of an acceptance of opinions which espoused the strictly material basis of reality.

> "Despite the reluctance of the Church and of some isolated cases of violation, public servants were not molested for their religious or political ideas... avowed republicans or atheists could remain in their posts in public administration or teaching."[13]

The elements of the paradigm in power after the restoration were, basically, individualism, reliability of knowledge, and dualism.

Paradigmatic Influence on Education

The general impact on education was beneficial. It became less intolerant of private opinions.[14] The Free Institute of Teaching was founded to counterbalance the still remaining negative influences of the preparadigmatic orientation of much of the educational system, especially at the elementary and secondary levels.[15] These negative influences were the neglect of the sciences and the indoctrination into Catholic belief no matter what the views of the students were.

Educational Aims

The aims of the national education system and those of the Free Institute of Teaching were in conflict. The government aimed at modernity as embodied in efficiency and technological progress; the Free Institute of Teaching aimed at the reformation of society's ideals and values.[16]

The political aim of the national education system was stability. Hence it was interested in indoctrination in Catholicism (which supported the government) and in the elimination of critical ideas. It was for these reasons that the Krausist professors[17] were expelled from the University of Madrid for protesting the suppression of educational freedom in 1875.[18] Because of the prestige of these professors, the government finally relented and allowed freedom in teaching (1881), but confined it as much as possible to the higher education level.

The politival aim of the Free Institute of Teaching[19] was the transformation of the government into,

> " ... a cultivation destined to improve society and refine it. The ruler conceived as a cultivator, takes the place of a teacher... " [20]

Giner believed, rather naively, in the power of education to change society, provided enough time was allowed and all the elements of society, no matter their beliefs, cooperated in an atmosphere of mutual respect.[21]

The social aim of the national education system was to preserve the contemporary structure of society.[22] Hence the alliance of the government with the Church in keeping the hold of the Church on secondary and primary education.[23] Habits of obedience had to be inculcated early in the poor, and the rich had to justify their own position to themselves.

The social aim of the Free Institute of Teaching was to create a more human person. Imbued with respect for his fellow men and nature, men could construct an educational system that would train and develop,

> " ... all functions and energies of body and soul. " [24]

The social aim, as expressed through an essentially humanistic intent, was to rid society of superstition and fanaticism, and substitute understanding and cooperation.[25]

The economic aim of both the national education and the Free Institute of Teaching was the same as that of the first Bourbons in the eighteenth century, namely,

> " ... instruction... directed towards material happiness and the increase of wealth... " [26]

The difference was that the government protected the economic status quo and the Free Institute of Teaching was not com-

mitted to this- aiming at an aristocracy of merit, no matter their economic background.

Paradigm one originated the political, social, and economic aims of the national education system because it emphasized change within the traditional system which would not drastically alter the system. Paradigms one and two originated the aims of the Free Institute of Teaching. Paradigm one contributed the importance of some elements of tradition, and paradigm two contributed the importance of learning the sciences. The national education system reflected the protective interests of the ruling classes. The Free Institute of Teaching reflected the diverse interests of Giner, who was not class minded.[27]

Curriculum

The curricula of both the national education and the Free Institute of Teaching was essentially the same, reflecting the priority of the humanities over the sciences, but not neglecting the sciences either.[28]

The curriculum of the national education system, with respect to higher education, remained essentially that of the Bourbon's. There were courses in the Humanities (Classical languages, Literature, History, etc.), and in the Sciences (Botany, Physics, Chemistry, etc.). These courses were offered at the universities. There were also technical institutes which gave instruction in such subjects as metallurgy, engineering, and mining. The subjects of the various institutes were "practical", i.e. they were designed for the purpose of training Spaniards in the skills needed to

run and maintain a "modern" society in the nineteenth century. The subjects taught at the universities were of little practical use to the society because they emphasized "knowing" instead of doing.[29] There was little or no research in the sciences during this period- science was merely a set of lectures, as was every other subject.[30]

The national education curriculum of secondary education contained few scientific subjects and was correspondingly predominantly humanistic. This was true also of private education.[31] Secondary education remained preparatory to university education which led to employment in the public services. The influence of the universities was instrumental in the continued decadence of secondary education.[32]

The Free Institute of Teaching's curriculum was also predominantly humanistic but had a greater number of subjects (see table two). It was the result of the many influences which had shaped the founders of the Institute, above all, that of the Austrian philosopher, Krause.

> " Krause initiated Froebel to the works of Comenius who then published the extracts. The reading of Comenius encouraged Froebel to set up an educational system for children, ... The teachers at the Free Institute knew of the works and methodes of this admirer of Krause. It is thus that the Spanish pedagogical movement at the end of the nineteenth century was partly Rousseavian through the intermediary of Pestalozzi, and partly Comenian through the intermediary of Krause. "[33]

The curriculum was intended to be vocational, not in the sense of learning a skill that is unintellectual but materially useful, but in the sense of knowledge that could refine and better society.

TABLE TWO

The Curriculum of the Free Institute of Teaching

- Traditional Subjects (inherited from the first Bourbons and consisting of Humanities and Science)
- Anthropology
- Technology
- Social Sciences
- Economics
- Art
- Drawing
- Singing
- Handwork
- History of Art
- Moral Education
- Character Training

" All the subjects are given simultaneously and grow each year more complicated and detailed. "

Extra-Curricular Activities

- excursions to the country
- excursions to museums
- mountain climbing
- skiing
- games (many of them English in origin)
- and other activities

Information and quotation taken from J. Castillejo's, Wars of Ideas in Spain (London, 1937), p. 96.

Elementary education in the national school system remained confined to the basics and religion. Anyone who had only this type of education was condemned to live in ignorance of how to better his situation.

The curricula of the national education system and the Free Institute of Teaching reflected the influence of the first Bourbons. All that had been added was, in the case of the national education, a lot of Liberal rhetoric, and, in the case of the Free Institute of Teaching, the philosophical influence of Froebel, Pestalozzi, Herbert, Rousseau, and above all, Krause. The curricula of both was inadequate to provide the trained manpower needed to develop Spain.[34]

The curricula of the national education system remained paradigm one. But that of the Free Institute of Teaching was a combination of paradigms one and two. The curricula of the national education was determined by the policies of the government and national tradition, both of which were under the control or influence of the landowning-industrialist class.[35] The curricula of the Free Institute of Teaching was predominantly influenced by its Spanish environment but it alsoacknowledged many foreign influences[36] which made it the most progressive educational institution in Spain, necessarily it did not conform completely to the wishes of the ruling class.[37]

Effects of Education

The ameliorative effects of education upon the political, social, and economic make-up of the country were neglegible. The educational system perpetuated the status

neglegible. The educational system perpetuated the status quo despite the efforts of men like Giner.

The political effect of the national education system was the maintenance of the great inequalities existing between various levels of society. Thus, vecause of their ignorance, the peasants of the south were prey to the machinations of the caciques, which effectively deprived the lower classes of the opportunity to exercise political power.[38] Lower class ignorance made them also believe in all sorts of utopianisms, such as Anarchism.[39] The national education system had very few ameliorative effects upon the politics of the country.

The political effects of the Free Institute of Teaching were confined to the educational field (and even here the effect was not marked). The prestige of its teachers was instrumental in securing educational freedom for teachers, particularly in institutions of higher learning, and for the acceptance of foreign educationists' ideas. The Free Institute of Teaching had no effect upon the political situation of the country.

The social effects of the national education[40] were conservatism among the upper, middle, and parts of the lower class (especially in the northern provinces) and radicalism among sections of the lower class (especially in the cities and among the landless labourers of the southern provinces).[41] The radicalism was, as has already been stated, of the utopian variety,[42] and the conservatism was preservation of the contemporary status quo as much as possible, no matter how

unjust some of its features were. The social effects of the national education were a deeper polarization of Spanish society.

The social effect of the Free Institute of Teaching was the creation of a group of men who put the welfare of the state above that of their class.[43] In the period under discussion, this group was confined to the founders of the Institute, and so had little effect- it was only at the turn of the century that the disciples of Giner began to exert greater influence. Still, this influence was confined entirely to educational matters and consequently had minimal impact on the social conditions.[44]

The economic effect of the general education system was a modest increase in engineers, metallurgists, and other skilled people, but still not in sufficient quantities to make Spain a truly industrialized and developed nation. The reason for this educational failure was that not enough money was being pumped into the system because of the entrepreneurial ideal's slow adoption. Spaniards were still influenced by aristocratic prejudices[45] and wanted to make a profit in the shortest possible time for the least amount of investment.[46] Education remained financially handicapped. The other economic effect of the national education was the failure to provide an economic opportunity for economic advancement. There was, thus, no material incentive for the lower orders to obtain an education. The economic effects of the national education system were very modest.

The economic effects of the Free Institute of Teaching

were nelegible during this period. The effects of the Institute were to be felt later, in the twentieth century.

The political, social, and economic effects of the national education system and of the Free Institute of Teaching were, taken all together, generally unfavourable to industrial and economic development; they were also instrumental in the further polarization of Spanish society.

The effects of the national education system were predominantly conditioned by the first paradigm which has an epistemology which puts restraints on the extent to which an unbiased investigation can proceed. Consequently, there was positively little encouragement from the national system of education to develop studies which would or could contribute to the destruction of the contemporary state of affairs. On the part of many Spaniards, this was as much an intellectual conviction as it was an expedient one. Moreover, the axiology, which substituted individual welfare for national welfare, acted as a safety valve. It was not the fault of the education system that contributed to the lower classes' ignorance but their lack of initiative in trying to get a better education or improving themselves by looking for better work. By thus displacing the resentment from the structural arrangement of society to the individual, the axiology's intent was to preserve the status quo. Important to consider was the continued influence of the preparadigms, especially in elementary education. There, the reliance was on authority and the indoctrination of the acceptance of an unjust system in this world for the just

system of the next world.[47] The hoped-for result of such an education is political stability. The dominant influence of the first paradigm in Spanish life contributed to the lack of educational influence in ameliorating the defects of Spanish society.

The effects of the Free Institute of Teaching were hampered by the influence of the first paradigm because the Free Institute of Teaching was giving an education that was predominantly paradigm two in outlook. The Free Institute of Teaching, thus emphasized the national over the individual. The influence of the first paradigm was also present in the outlook of the institute in the form of a heavy concentration on the Humanities. Nevertheless, the Free Institute of Teaching remained predominantly inspired by the view of the second paradigm in a society still under the influence of paradigm one.

State of Education

From 1868 to 1898, the educational system went through three phases: the first phase (1868-1875) granted academic freedom, the second phase (1875-1881) took away academic freedom but saw the birth of the Free Institute of Teaching, and the third phase (1881-1898) reestablished academic freedom due to the influence of the Free Institute of Teaching. Educational aims, curricula, and effects were generally paradigm one in outlook and in conditioning, although the influence of the second paradigm was beginning to be felt, especially at the Free Institute of Teaching. Preparadigms were also outlooks to be reckoned with because of the in-

fluence of the Church in secondary and, especially, elementary education. Due to the paradigmatic backwardness and confusion of Spain during this period, education remained ineffective and limited to a minority.[48]

[1]That is more freer in comparison to the intolerance often practiced under cover during the early Liberal period.

[2]R. Carr, Spain 1808-1939, (Oxford, 1966), p. 324.

[3]Ibid., pp. 335-336.

[4]Because the archaicness of its creed was becoming obvious to many of their former supporters.

[5]R. Carr, p. 303.

[6]The Bourbons finally granted academic freedom but it was a forced concession.

[7]R. Carr, p. 332.

[8]Ibid., p. 332.

[9]In this way the reform of society is postponed.

[10]Radicalism was now increasingly associated with movements that wanted to fundamentally alter the society.

[11]Anarchism was such a philosophy.

[12]J. T. Reid, Modern Spain and Liberalism, A Study in Literary Contrasts (Stanford University Press, 1937), p. 3.

[13]J. Castillejo, Wars of Ideas in Spain (London and Beccles, 1937), p. 105.

[14]J. Castillejo, Education and Revolution in Spain, (London, 1937), pp. 15-16.

[15]Ibid., p. 17.

[16]Ibid., p. 17.

[17]Those who believed in the ideas of the Austrian philosopher Krause.

[18]The professors founded the Free Institute of Teaching in 1876.

[19]The political aim was very idealistic.

[20]J. Castillejo, Wars of Ideas in Spain (London and Beccles, 1937), p. 92.

[21]J. Castillejo, Wars of Ideas in Spain (London and Beccles, 1937), p. 101.

[22]Education could not aid in teaching new ways of viewing.

[23]The Church was a conservative institution which fostered a conservative attitude.

[24]J. Castillejo, p. 96.

[25]This was impossible in the very polarized Spain of the late nineteenth century.

[26]J. Castillejo, Education and Revolution in Spain (London, 1937), p. 12.

[27]J. Castillejo, Wars of Ideas in Spain (London and Beccles, 1937), p. 92.

[28]The sciences could no longer be neglected if Spain was to in any sense progress.

[29]J. Castillejo, Wars of Ideas in Spain, p. 95.

[30]Education tended to be bookish because the experimental sciences were still in their infancy in Spain

[31]Private education was subject to the same conditions.

[32]The secondary schools were preparatory to university.

[33]Y. Turin, L'education et L'ecole en Espagne de 1874 a 1902, Liberalisme et Tradition (Paris, 1959), p. 207

[34]They were developing many people with degrees in Letters but not enough people in the sciences.

[35]Both were conservative and afraid of radicalism.

[36]J. Castillejo, Education and Revolution in Spain (London, 1937), p. 17

[37]Because it refused to be made an instrument of the state like the other schools.

[38]See R. W. Kern's, Liberal Reformers and Caciques in Restoration Spain 1875-1909 (The University of New Mexico Press, 1974), passim.

[39]Anarchism was a simple creed which promised to rid all misery.

[40]Private schools are also included.

[41]See R. Carr, Spain 1808-1939 (Oxford, 1966), pp. 438-441.

[42]Anarchism began to spread very fast.

[43]Because they were taught to think of education as a means to regenerate the nation.

[44]Giner's insistance on apoliticism made the school somewhat isolated from national events.

[45]For the origin see A. Castro's, The Structure of Spanish History (Priceton, 1954), passim.

[46]R. Carr, p. 274.

[47]Christianity has always favoured the next world.

[48]See J. A. Lacomba's, Introduccion a la Historia Economica de la Espana Contemporanea (Madrid, 1969), p. 186.

Chapter V

RADICALISM AND CONSERVATISM, 1898-1939

Education came under the influence of the Free Institute of teaching. There was some influence from Anarchism in the early years of the twentieth century but this influence was stamped out by 1910. Education advanced and improved but it became more and more subject to the ideologies of the various governments in power.

Paradigmatic Influence

There was a gradual shift from the predominance of the first paradigm to the near predominance of the second paradigm during these forty years. These years were also, crisis filled. The three major crisis were: (1) the Spanish-American War in 1898, (2) the Moroccan War between 1909 and 1926, and (3) the Civil War of 1936 to 1939. Each crisis led to a greater polarization of the society until the Civil War finally brought to a climax more than a century of political, social, and economic rifts.

The defeat of Spain in the Spanish-American War and the loss of the remainder of the colonial empire,[1] which had been founded four hundred years before, signalled the end of an epoch in Spanish history. Naturally, this event led to much soul searching about why Spain had lost so much of her power, prestige, and cultural glory. The intellectual ferment gave birth to the Generation of '98, which claimed such lights as Ortega y Gasset and Unamuno.[2]

The long, and often disastrous, Moroccan War strained

to the breaking point the fabric of the country. There were hostilities between those who opposed the monarchy (which was blamed for the length and failures of the war) and those who defended the king. Radicals of all sorts thus had an opportunity to riot and rebel. Political violence became too great for the king who found himself unable to control the situation through regular means, so when General Rivera made a Pronunciamiento and became dictator (1923) it was with the full blessing of the monarchy. He brought back some stability by temporarily stopping many of the party conflicts. He did this by bringing various shades of opinion under a single party called the Patriotic Union.[3] The drift, however, had already gone too far for the various ideologies to find common ground for compromise, and Rivera eventually resigned in 1930. In the space of one year, a republic was proclaimed. The republic soon found itself torn apart by the conflict between the Left and the Right. A Left victory in February 1936 was the signal a few months later for the military uprising which resulted in the Civil War. Outside help tipped the balance in favour of the Right which finally succeeded in destroying both Liberal and Radical Spain in 1939.

The period between 1898 and 1923 saw the transition from paradigm one to paradigm one and one half.[4] The Rivera years from 1923 to 1930 continued in paradigm one and one half but there was less apothegmatic agitation than in the previous years. The second republic (1931-1939) made the transition to paradigm two but it fell victim to both the forces of the first and second paradigms, and to an apothegm.[5]

Between 1898 and 1939, Spain finally reached the paradigm that had been reached by the developed countries of western Europe in the eighteenth century, namely the second paradigm.[6]

The axiology of the first phase (1898-1923) changed from a concern for the individual to that of a concern for both the individual and national needs. This was indicative of a change to paradigm one and one half, and was derived from a synthesis of the needs of the landowners and the industrialists who gradually became estranged from one another.[7] It was also derived from an attempt to diffuse the apothegmatic influence of the socialists and anarchists. The axiology of the second phase (1923-1931) was an attempt to consolidate paradigm one and one half. It was derived from the fear the industrialists of Catalonia felt at the continuance of apothegmatic agitation.[8] The axiology remained individualistic and nationalistic. The axiology of the third phase (1931-1939) replaced individualism-nationalism with nationalism. This was a move to paradigm two, and was derived from the interests of the middle classes in trying to shift the focus of growing apothegmatic action from themselves to the landowning section of society. In a subphase (1936-1939) in the republican zone, the apothegmatic forces became dominant in the form of communist influence, but the exigencies of the war precluded any thorough implementation of their program. As a result, the axiology remained, basically, at the paradigm two level.

The epistemology of the first and second phases was

concerned with the reliability of scientific knowledge and was beginning to extend this reliability beyond the material sphere and into the spiritual,[9] also the importance of the physical was clearly gaining preference over the spiritual.[10] This was the outcome of an axiology of individualism-nationalism and its exultation of the primacy of the nation in certain areas- this required a thorough scientific understanding of the social and economic make-up of the country in order to better it. The epistemology of the third phase was concerned with the reliability of scientific knowledge and its expansion into all other areas of human experience. This originated in the triumph of national over individual needs, which was the axiology of the third phase. National needs had to be met in terms of scientific data.

The ontology of the first and second phases was still dualistic but was beginning to acknowledge the desirability of a less rigid division. This was derived from the paradigm one and one half epistemology. The ontology of the third phase was the process of exchange leading to balance. The ontology originated in the epistemology of paradigm two since a process of exchange and balance was possible only if useful elements existed (there were very few of these that were acknowledged between Spanish Catholicism and modern science).

There was a shift in the paradigmatic elements from the set of: (1) individualism-nationalism, (2) reliability of scientific knowledge, and (3) dualism (all of which constituted paradigm one and one half) to the set of:

(1) nationalism, (2) reliability of knowledge detirmined primarily by science, and (3) the process of exchange (all of which constituted paradigm two). This shift in the paradigm in power coincided with the decline of the influence of the landowning element in society who had supported the elements of paradigms one and one and one half, and the rise to influence of more of the middle classes during the twenties and thirties. The reason for this shift in the class in power (partially) was the growing industrialization of the country which had prospered from its neutrality during the first world war.[11]

Paradigmatic Influence on Education

The general impact of the paradigmatic influence on education was beneficial.[12] The sciences were eagerly pursued and a concerted effort (especially during the second republic) was made to end, or at least greatly diminish, Church influence. Above all, education was expanded more than in any other period of Spanish history.[13] All this derived from the aim of the second paradigm and (to a lesser extent) paradigm one and one half to try to inculcate a more modern view of the world by substituting, as much as possible, science for religion. The result would be a more enlightened public and a more developed country.

Educational Aims

The aim of the educational system was modernization (which was both a paradigm one and two concept) to which was added the influence of the Free Institute of Teaching (which was strongly paradigm two in outlook). During this

period, the Free Institute of Teaching became very prominent.

The political aim of education from 1898 to 1931 was maintenance of the status quo.[14] A large measure of influence for this change must go to the Free Institute of Teaching- Giner's recommendations for educational reform were accepted by a Liberal government,[15] and a Central Commission for the advancement of studies and scientific research was established in 1907.[16]

> " It (the Junta) included twenty-one men of various shades of opinion, from Catholics and absolutists to free-thinkers and republicans... It attempted only measures and reforms common to all parties, and shunned any initiative on the political or religious battlefield. "[17]

From 1931 to 1939 the apoliticism of education[18] was destroyed by the extreme polarization of the country and the Civil War, which left no room for neutrality.

The social aim of education was, in higher education, a bettering of the total condition of human beings. This also became the aim of secondary and elementary education, but mainly during the republic- before the republic, the social aim of elementary and secondary education was the preservation of the traditional status quo.[19]

> " Provision was made for an unprecedented program for the construction of new state schools, and from 1931 to 1933 over nine thousand new institutions were built by the government... Every effort was made, through education, to raise Spain from the status of a most backward nation to that of a modern, literate republic. "[20]

The social aim of education, derived mostly from the em-

phasis of the second paradigm in expanding education to raise the general level of the country, came closer to being realized than at any other previous time.

The economic aim of education remained fundamentally, the economic development of the nation throughout this period (1898-1939), but there was a split in how this should be achieved. In the period from 1898 to 1931, development was held to be possible, without disturbing the fundamental economic structures of Spanish society, through education. In the period of the republic, education was seen as a help towards modernization, but there was also a need for change in the economic structure. The secondary and elementary schools, officially secularized during the republic,[21] contributed little or nothing to economic improvement; they perpetuated the economic inequalities by providing no economically useful skills.

The economic, social, and political aims of education originated in paradigm one and one half and in paradigm two. The economic aim before the republic was paradigm one and one half influenced. This paradigm aimed at economic self-sufficiency through a semi-industrial capitalist system of economy. This paradigm originated in the industrialists, mainly Catalan, who wanted to protect the Spanish market for their goods and to bring about a reversal of the trend towards free trade since this would put their comparatively undeveloped manufacturing industry at a disadvantage. The landowners also favoured this paradigmatic way of viewing the situation because they did not want to

improve their system of agriculture- the requirements would be costly and the benefits would take a while to be realized.[22] All these considerations were too entrepreneurial for the landowners. The economic aim during the republic was to change the economic structure of society by conscientizing the populace.[23] This was a predominantly paradigm two consideration and was derived from the eclipse of the landowning and conservative industrialist interests to the newer elements of the middle classes and of course, to the agitation of the urban proletariat. However, many considerations, including, most importantly, the Civil War, made the economic aim temporary in its realization. The social aim of education was, during the pre-republican period, influenced by the status quo attitude of paradigm one and one half. This was especially true in regards to elementary and secondary education. During the republic, the power eclipse of the old conservative classes led to a pre[illegible]inant influence of the second paradigm and its secul[illegible]ist bent. The study of the sciences greatly progressed in higher education, and experiments were made in teaching techniques and new courses in other levels of education.[24] The Left election victory in 1936 did not have a chance to influence the school to any extent because of the Civil War. Had the Left been military successful, no doubt apothegmatic influence in all levels of education would have greatly increased. The pre-republican political aim was of course, paradigm one and one half in origin, i.e. recognizing that there was popular discontent but at the same time not

wishing to rock the statud quo. This was derived from the shared recognition between the classes who held power that the influence of various apothegmatic philosophies among the working poor, especially in large urban areas, could be fatal to their continued dominance of society. This political aim was largely nullified by the worsening economic conditions of the period. The republican aim was of course, different. Influenced by paradigm two and its practical concerns, the political aim of education was successful for the period of time the regime lasted. Students were conscientized to a greater degree- they were not completely conscientized because of the practical limitations the republican government faced in realizing its political educational aim- among these limitations was the shortage of lay teachers which made the anti-clerical legislation a practically dead matter.[25] All in all, the aims of education during this period of forty-one years reflected, with various degrees of faithfulness, the paradigmatic changes of the times.

Curriculum

The curriculum during the last period of Liberal rule reflected a growing acceptance of science and its extension into new domains of reality plus a willingness to experiment. All this showed the progressive influence of the paradigmatic change of the period.

The curriculum of higher education greatly benefitted from the influence of the junta (see table three) and foreign contacts (which introduced Spaniards to the more

TABLE THREE

A Sample of the Higher Education Curriculum Inspired by the Efforts of the Junta

- History
- Philosophy
- Classics
- Mathematics
- Chemistry
- Physics
- Botany
- Zoology
- Geology
- Histology
- Physiology
- Genetics
- Paleontology

Information taken from Jose Castillejo's, Education and Revolution in Spain (Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 19.

advanced paradigms of other more developed nations). Above all, the curriculum of the Universities was adapted to research for the first time, and this research was directed mainly towards the sciences.[26] This was of course, due to the increasing influence of the second paradigm.

The curricula of secondary and elementary education remained, however, humanistic throughout the period- a measure of the tenacity of the first paradigm and the preparadigms in their hold upon these levels of education. One brilliant exception was the small private school in Madrid called the Spanish International School[27] which based its curriculum on the dominant mental faculties of students in the different ages. Its success lay in teaching children subjects by the direct method in which the subject was first used and gradually afterwards a grasp of the meaning was attained. Very abstract subjects were reserved for a time when the faculty of reason was sufficiently developed. All kinds of subjects could be taught (see table four). The dominant paradigmatic influence operating in the Spanish International School was that of the second paradigm with its concern for practicality (the necessary conclusion of a world view based primarily on sense data).

In sum, the curricula of the educational system was inspired by the two paradigms already mentioned, and by remnents of paradigm one and the preparadigms. Potentially important, for a while, were the apothegms. The influence of the two dominant paradigms was most keenly felt in higher education, but secondary and elementary education

TABLE FOUR

A Sample of the Subjects Taught at the Spanish International School

- Modern Languages	-	taught by the
- Arithmetic		direct
- Natural Sciences		method
- Geography		
- History		
- Literature	-	
- Grammar	-	reserved until
- Logic		reason has
- Philosophy		sufficiently
- Others	-	developed

Information taken from Jose Castillejo's, Education and Revolution in Spain (Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 24.

could not altogether escape their influence either.

Effects of Education

The effects of the education system on Spanish society were limited because of the smallness of its extent. This was a measure of the slowing down effect of paradigm one and one half, especially before the republic.[28]

> " By 1931, even in the larger cities, less than half the children attended school. "[29]

Spanish society was feeling the effects of changes in other institutions much more. Thus, the potential ameliorative effect of education on politics was largely nullified- higher education remained mostly politically neutral,[30] while secondary and elementary education remained committed basically, to the status quo. The influence of paradigm one and one half remained quite strong even under the republic because its political conservatism was reinforced by the remnants of paradigm one and preparadigm influence. The social effects of education provided some contrast to this gloomy picture, but these were mostly limited to a minority of the population. Once again the caution inherent in a paradigm one and one half interpretation of reality prevailed. In higher education, there was the breakdown of the old, conservative class interest (but this was restricted to those institutions greatly influenced by the Junta) and an attempt to help all Spaniards. This was due to the strong paradigm two influence in the Junta which was against the dominance of the old upper class and enjoined tolerance of different religious and intellectual views. In the other levels of

education, the social benefits were nearly non-existant because of the much greater influence of paradigm one and the preparadigms. Nevertheless, some conscientization did take place during the brief period of the republic. The economic effects of education during this period were thus, potentially very great but the predominant influence of paradigm one and one half throughout most of the period insured that the conditions for its realization were very restricted. As a result, education had very little or no influence upon the economy. Nevertheless, a foundation of knowledge was constructed upon which the expansion of the future would be built. In sum, the political, social, and economic effects of education were potentially beneficial but the predominance of paradigm one and one half throughout most of the period insured that most of these potential effects were not realized.

The State of Education

The state of education from 1898 to 1939 gradually improved. The slowness of its improvement and the smallness of its effects on the society was a measure of the strength of the cautious paradigm one and one half and the slow-changing class structure of the society. Also, the turbulent conditions of the time shifted attention from education to other concerns.

[1]The loss of the empire could not be compensated for by gains in Morroco.

[2]The Generation of '98 were men who wanted to regenerate Spain and make her once again a part of the regular European civilization.

[3]This grouping was inherently unstable and failed to bring the party peace desired by the dictator.

[4]Constitutional monarchy was firmly established; science developed in the universities.

[5]The rivalry between anarchists, communists, and socialists ultimately destroyed the republic.

[6]Spain was more than one hundred years behind Britain and France.

[7]As the economy developed, industrialists became more important than landowners.

[8]Strikes were bad for business. See R. Carr, Spain 1808-1939 (Oxford, 1966), p. xxvi.

[9]Scientific examination was no longer as impeded as before by the Church.

[10]The sciences were becoming more and more popular at the universities.

[11]Fortunes were made in the sale of munitions to both sides.

[12]Education was beginning to reflect and meet the realities of the Spanish situation.

[13]The lieracy rate was steadily increasing.

[14]The influential classes feared the outcome of radical influence.

[15]J. Castillejo, Education and Revolution in Spain (London, 1937), p. 18.

[16]Ibid., p. 18.

[17]Ibid., p. 18.

[18]A cardinal point of Giner.

[19]The lower classes had to be made less succeptible to the influence of radical philosophies.

[20]J. T. Reid, Modern Spain and Liberalism, A Study in Literary Contrasts (Stanford University Press, 1937), p. 26

[21]But many clerics continued to be employed because there was a shortage of lay teachers.

[22]The agricultural situation had hardly improved since the nineteenth century.

[23]The level of literacy was raised by the building of many schools.

[24]J. Castillejo, p. 23.

[25]W. W. Brickman, Educational Reform and Renewal in Contemporary Spain (Washington, 1972), p. 7.

[26]J. Castillejo, p. 24.

[27]Ibid., p. 34.

[28]The ruling classes were very cautious because of fear of radicalism.

[29]J. M. Sanchez, Reform and Reaction (The University of North Carolina Press, 1964), p. 38.

[30]This was due to the influence of Giner.

Part III

COMPROMISE AND MODERNITY, 1939-1970

The government established by the Nationalists was authoritarian and fascistic at the beginning of the regime, but gradually the trappings of fascism were discarded to decrease international hostility towards the regime, but it remained authoritarian. Under this authoritarianism (and with considerable help from the United States), Spain moved to a position of semi-development.

The period witnessed a paradigmatic shift, during the early years of the regime (c. 1939-1953), backwards to paradigm one and one half. But during the late fifties and early sixties there was a shift back to a basically paradigm two position.

Chapter VI

AUTHORITARIANISM AND DEVELOPMENT, 1939-1969

Education became more responsive to the economic and social needs of the country. As centralized as ever, education was beginning to respond to the various advances in technology and trying to make itself a means of social mobility.

Paradigmatic Influence

The victory of the Nationalists was followed by a wave of repression which continued well into the forties.[1] The years between 1945 and 1953 were ones of political ostracism which was only terminated because of the realities of Cold

War politics which made Spain attractive- its attitude towards Communism was completely hostile, and it was strategically located in the Mediterranean. American aid (in return for bases of course) poured into the country, enabling a rapid growth of industry. From the midfifties on, the history of the regime has been relatively calm, except for some demonstrations and strikes in the late sixties and Basque terrorism in the seventies. Both of these activities were aimed at some of the policies of the government.

The axiology of the first phase of the Franco regime (1939-1953) was paradigm one and one half because of the return to power of many of the old elements such as the Church.[2] This axiology valued both individualism[3] and nationalism, and was derived from the eclectic, conservative interests which had come to power under the nationalists. The axiology of the second phase (1953-1969) was still individualism-nationalism but the nationalism element had become much more important. This was very close to paradigm two. It was the result of the growing influence of technocrats who wanted to modernize the country in as short a time as possible. These technocrats valued science, of course. What made them not come to the paradigm two position was their belief that they could achieve their aims without upsetting the political system imposed by Franco (in a genuine paradigm two situation, the political system is overthrown because the political system is built upon a small scale manufacturing economy and its supporters, and so becomes a hindrance to the practical realization of the

nation wide corporate economic programs and ideals of the supporters of the second paradigm).

The epistemology of the first phase was characterized by the reliability of scientific knowledge being restricted to only the material sphere. This was paradigm one and one half and was derived from an axiology of individualism-nationalism.[4] The epistemology of the second phase declared that many portions of the non-material universe would be more adequately explained by scientific knowledge. This originated in an axiology which put greater stress on nationalism than on individualism, and was very near to paradigm two.

From an epistemology favouring the restricted reliability of scientific knowledge (during the first phase), there emerged an ontology of partial dualism- reality was composed of both a material and a spiritual sphere, most of the latter not being accessible to scientific investigation. From an epistemology favouring the greater extension of scientific knowledge during the second phase, there came to be an ontology of near monism- reality was composed more of a material component than a non-material one.

The years from 1939 to 1969 witnessed two paradigmatic shifts, the net result of which was to regain the paradigmatic position achieved under the republic.

Paradigmatic Influence on Education

The impact of the first phase paradigmatic change was to tighten the governmental control of education by ending academic freedom, the control of secondary and pri-

mary education was securely set on the shoulders of the Church. The impact of the second phase was the relative loosening of academic control by the government, and a great extension of the sciences being taught. Paradigmatic influence on education then, has been both reactionary and progressive.

Educational Aims

The educational aim from the years 1939 to 1969 has been change without the destruction of traditional Spanish values, and without harming the welfare of the country.[5]

The political aim of education was the stability of the regime.[6] Thus, the ideal of Giner, political neutrality, was destroyed.[7] This was accomplished in higher education through the purging of the students and the staff as part of the general "cleansing" which occured after the Civil War. Along with this purging, there was the destruction of academic freedom. In the secondary and elementary systems of education, political acquiescence was accomplished through the Church.

> " The Spanish Church has always been a politically conservative institution. Its support of conservative governments has been conditioned in part by the knowledge that it has survived in Spain for over fifteen centuries... the Church has preferred those governments which have promised it a privileged position and which have guaranteed domestic stability within the country. "[8]

The social aim of education was to deradicalize Spanish society. This applied at all levels of education. As the Education Law of 1945 said,

> " ... (education is) to provide all citizens with a 'general obligatory culture', (and) to form the child's will, consciousness, and character toward the fullfilment of his duty and eternal destiny ... "[9]

The economic aim of education was, as always, the economic development of the country. In the 1960's this became more evident because the economy had developed to the point where there was the need for education to put its imput. But more had to be done for education to play its full part in development.

The political aim of education was derived from paradigm one and one half during the period from 1939 to 1969 (this was at the elite level), which stressed the greater importance of the nation over the individual. It was connected to the revived power of the old power elites. The social aim of education originated with the same paradigm but lasted until 1953 only. From that date onward, there was the emergence of a new group of people, the technocrats, who wanted to modernize the country quickly; this was moving towards paradigm two which stressed even more the importance of the nation over that of the individual; in fact the needs of the individual are determined to a great extent by those of the nation. The economic aim of education was inspired in the first phase (1939-1953) by paradigm one and one half and the understandable caution of the government; in the second phase (1953-1969), the educational economic aim was influenced by a near paradigm two position (the result of the increasing power of a newer

generation of people belonging, in sentiment at least, to the more developed paradigms of the developed world (Spain never having imposed an iron curtain around itself). All this indicated the beginnings of a move from semi-development to development.

Curriculum

The curricula of the various levels of education revealed the influences of the paradigmatic shifts, and the influences of an expanding economy.

The curriculum of higher education suffered to some extent by the advent of Francoism during its, i.e. Francoism's, first phase because of the academic repression. The promising work of the universities during the twenties and thirties was temporarily discontinued. During the second phase- the government feeling more secure and thus more open to the influences of a paradigm higher than one and one half- the universities were given a breathing space from repression, and their curricula were reformed to meet the needs of the economy (of course much remained to be done before the full potential of the university was realized)- table five gives an idea of what this curriculum was like. Nevertheless, many universities still showed a preference, in terms of student enrollment, for such subjects as Law and the Humanities, indicating the strength of preparadigmatic and paradigmatic influences even in the sixties.[10] Other higher education institutes and schools offered a wide variety of technical and specialized courses.[11] This is an indication of the growing influences of

TABLE FIVE

Faculties of a Full University

- Law
- Medicine
- Pharmacy
- Philosophy and Letters
- Political Science
- Economics
- Commerce
- Veterinary Medicine
- Science
- 2 years of physical training
- 2-3 years of formacion politica
- 2-4 years of religion

- These three subjects are given at all universities

Information taken from William W. Brickman's, Educational Reform and Renewal in Contemporary Spain (Washington, 1972), pp. 17-18.

paradigm two and its interest in science and its applicability to general life.

The curriculum of secondary education remained mainly at the paradigm one,and one and one half stage throughout the first phase of the Franco regime, and only began to change in the sixties with the increasing influence of paradigm two and the resulting economic stimulus.[12] There was a wide variety of secondary educational schools which offered vocational, specialized, and technical courses designed to make the graduate contribute to the economic prosperity of the country.[13] The general secondary educational curriculum (see table six) tried to give as well rounded a system of subjects as possible to prepare students for the different areas they would want to enter afterwards.

The curriculum of elementary education was put under the influence of the Church by the Nationalist government from the very onset of its existence, and it remained so.[14] The curriculum was designed to perpetuate the traditional Spanish values (as interpreted by the Franco government) and to inculcate basic educational skills (see table seven). The elementary educational curriculum was clearly more intended for molding than for intellectual preparedness for secondary education.[15] This meant that elementary education was at best to remain at the preparadigmatic level since the Spanish Church has not been a paradigmatically inclined institution.[16]

The educational consequences of the paradigmatic shift from one and one half to two thus most clearly showed at

TABLE SIX

Curriculum of General Secondary Education

- Spanish
- Modern Language
- Latin
- Philosophy
- History
- Religious Instruction
- Geography
- Natural Science
- Mathematics
- Physics and Chemistry
- Drawing
- Physical Education

Adapted from E. M. Doherty's and G. A. Male's, Education in Spain (Washington, 1966), p. 12.

TABLE SEVEN

Curriculum of Elementary Education

- Reading
- Writing
- Religious Instruction
- History and Social Studies
- Geography
- Language and Literature
- Science
- Physical Education
- Drawing and Handwork
- Music
- Domestic Science
- Practical Work and Workshop
- Arithmetic

Adapted from E. M. Doherty's and G. A. Male's, Education in Spain (Washington, 1966), p. 9.

the higher levels of education; elementary and secondary education meanwhile continued at the preparadigmatic to paradigm one and one half level, although curriculum improvements were being discussed to make it fit more into the modernizing structure of the Spanish economy.

Effects of Education

The effects of the educational system were beneficial when the paradigmatically guided economic development has allowed it to be.

The political effect of higher education has been the creation of a student body less prone to accept the wisdom of the government and its supporting institutions in all matters.[17] Secondary and elementary education had little or no political effect.

The social effect of higher education was the creation of experts to, generally, run the economic affairs of the country or at least have some strong imput into the decisions being made, in contrast to the Spanish custom of having tradition and social or political prestige determine this.[18] The social effects of secondary and elementary education were the alleviation of the stresses of Spanish society originating in differential opportunities for social amelioration.

The economic effect of higher education was to put the economy generally in charge of people who knew something about it. This made possible the continuation of economic growth and development. And within this framework, economic growth and development was also made possible by

secondary education; its vocational and specialized programs contributed to the growth of the industrial sector.

The political effect of higher education was triggered by the very close approach to paradigm two that came about as a result of the new power of experts in the second phase. One of the claims of paradigm two was political liberty. In the first phase, it was influenced by paradigm one and one half because the old conservative elements were in complete charge of the country and the power of the experts had not yet appeared. The social effects of education in general has been twofold: (1) during the first phase, acceptance of the status quo because of the conservative influence of paradigm one and one half, and (2) in the second phase, greater mobility and a lessening of the influence of tradition derived from the very close approach to paradigm two. The economic effect of education was negligible during the first phase because it had come under the predominant influence of paradigm one and one half and its bent for a more humanistic type of education or at least one in which science was safe (in the broadest sense of the word). During the second phase, it came under the influence of paradigm two and began to exert a modernizing effect through expertise and efficiency.

State of Education

From 1939 to 1969, education was subject to two paradigmatic shifts as a result of the shift in influence of the elites in society. This shift first hampered and then extended the influence of education as a modernizing force.

During this period of thirty years, Spanish education came within easy reach of everyone for the first time.

[1]Those who suffered from this were those who had been active in the Civil war against Franco.

[2]The Church took an active role in reasserting its position in society.

[3]Within limits ofcourse.

[4]The Church's influence was quite strong under Franco who was very pious.

[5]This has been accomplished by a slow evolution in seeing by both the government and the Church.

[6]The regime needed stability because of international pressures against it.

[7]It could never survive in the authoritarian regime of Franco.

[9]W. W. Brickman, Educational Reform and Renewal in Contemporary Spain (Washington, 1972), p. 9.

[8]J. M. Sanchez, Reform and Reaction, (The University of North Carolina Press, 1964), pp. 215-216.

[10]See E. M. Doherty's, Education in Spain (Washington, 1966), p. 19.

[11]Ibid., pp. 20-23.

[12]The demands of the economy were being felt.

[13]Secondary educational institutions were no longer strictly preparatory in nature.

[14]The government and the Church worked hand in hand.

[15]W. w. Brickman, p. 12.

[16]Not in Spain in any case.

[17]This is paradoxical to the intent of the government.

[18]This was a new departure for Spain.

Chapter VII

THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1970

The Education Act of 1970 recognized the importance of all levels of education to the national life if Spain was to continue its modernization. The act has been, essentially, influenced by a paradigm two outlook.

Paradigmatic Influence on Education

The influence of the second paradigm on education has been beneficial to that institution because a new spirit of reform has taken over. This reform has in mind the renovation of all levels of education, to bring it in line with the best contemporary western educational systems.

Educational Aims

The aim of the education act was the preservation of the essentials of Spanish culture while modernizing to the highest degree possible.

> " ... balance the individual with the communal and national interests, the traditional and the modern, the past and the future, the national and the international. "[1]

The political aim of general education, according to the act, is to absorb the paradigm two position (which is for political liberty) into the authoritarian political framework of the country. This means that all other aims and aspects of education must be,

> " ... in conformity with the Principles of the National Movement (party) and the other Basic Laws of the Land. "[2]

The political aim of elementary education is,

> " ... to form co-operative attitudes and aptitudes in relation to local, national, and international community ... "[3]

Thus, the political molding is introduced at the very beginning of education. This is in line with the intentions of the second paradigm which seeks to control the population by seeking to extend education to all under the guise of national development. The political aim of secondary education, according to the act is,

> " ... the development of ... civic-social outlooks ... "[4]

This is supposed to equip the person for political co-operation. The political aim of higher education is neutrality. Political science is not handled by the majority of university institutions. From this it is evident that although the general thrust of the education act is paradigm two, the government still clings to a paradigm one and one half in many things because it is trying to preserve its authoritarian status when all around are governments of more developed nations which are democratic, and more advanced paradigmatically than paradigm two.

The social aim of general education is to be,

> " ... human, integral, and harmonious development of personality ... inspired by a Christian concept of life and the national traditions and culture; social integration and advancement ... "[5]

As can be seen from the above quote, the act is determined to retain some elements of the preparadigm (in terms of religion) and paradigm one (in terms of tradition) as a safeguard against any possible sort of dangerous view of

reality, i.e. dangerous to the government. The social aim of elementary education is,

> " ... to develop socio-civic awareness ... "[6]

This vague statement is intended to show the limits and possibilities of social improvement. The social aim of secondary education is,

> " ... the development of religious-moral ... outlooks; the inculcation of study, work, self-disciplinary habits ... "[7]

The social aim of secondary education is as vague as that of elementary education, and for the same reason. The social aim of higher education is,

> " ... to help improve ... socio-economic status. "[8]

The social aim of education is to locate people in their niche in the social structure of the nation. The twin ideas of control and development through education are most fully developed in paradigm two, and this can be seen clearly in higher education. In secondary and elementary education, the emphasis is somewhat more on paradigms one, and one and one half conformance. All this means that the government feels safe in presenting a generally paradigm two, or near it, education at the higher education level only if a good dose of paradigm one to one and one half authoritarian technique is presented at the elementary and secondary levels.

The economic aim of general education is,

> " ... acquisition of study and work habits ... to promote the ... scientific, and economic development of the country. "[9]

The economic aim of elementary education is contained in

its political and social aims, which is to develop good work habits. This comes from the first paradigm's desire to get the most possible out of each individual- it is the necessary step in accustoming the bulk of the population to the disciplined demands of an industrial labour force. The economic aim of secondary education is also contained in its political and social aims- the economic aim is to prepare the student for his place in the economic system, and to make him an efficient worker. This is also influenced by the transitional paradigm (one and one half) and its industrialization bent. The economic aim of higher education is,

> " ... to prepare young people fully for the technical, scientific, learned, and other professions needed by the country ... " [10]

Here the influence of the second paradigm is clearly shown. The economic aim of higher education is to prepare an expert elite to run the country.

In sum, the aims of education are moving generally towards the second paradigm (in the case of higher education, it is very near it or right in the second paradigm). There is some drag in the case of elementary and secondary education in that each of these is still strongly influenced by paradigm one and one half and a multitude of pre-scientific, social-institutional patterns of culture.

Curriculum

The curricula of the various educational levels remain nearly the same as described in chapter six. The main dif-

ference is in a different pedalogical approach to the teaching of the subjects, emphasizing the importance of the student in the educational process, and also the importance of diminishing a purely bookish type of education, especially at the elementary level.

The curricula of all educational levels is motivated by the shift, generally speaking, towards a paradigm two, or near two, position from earlier less scientifically oriented positions. This is most noticeable in higher education, with secondary and elementary education showing less influence.[11]

State of Education

The education act recognizes the need of Spanish education to improve so that it can help in the development of the economy. This is a paradigm two consideration, and by 1970 Spanish education had in its higher levels, generally, reached that paradigmatic position at least in the intentions of the education act. Finally, there was official recognition that education had to be linked with general Spanish life, and not merely with one aspect of it or with only one class. This consideration was considerably helped by the increase in power of the technocrats since the 1950's and the consequent decline of the more conservative forces.

[1]W. W. Brickman, Educational Reform and Renewal in Contemporary Spain (Washington, 1972), p. 32.

[2]Ibid., p. 32.

[3]Ibid., p. 35.

[4]Ibid., p. 36.

[5]Ibid., p. 32.

[6]Ibid., p. 35.

[7]Ibid., p. 36.

[8]Ibid., p. 37.

[9]Ibid., p. 32.

[10]Ibid., p. 37.

[11]The rights of the Church are guaranteed by the education act.

Chapter VIII

CONCLUSION

Spanish education from 1812 to 1970 progressed slowly from being the province of about five percent of the population to more than ninety percent. However, this progress was not spread evenly over the years- most of the advance was made in the last forty years from 1930 to 1970. The reason for this was the lack of economic and social development before the fifties- a consequence of the tenacious hold of paradigm one and paradigm one and one half intellegentsia fostered by a conservative ruling class predominantly (at least throughout the nineteenth century) pre-paradigmatic in its outlook. This put Spain generally two centuries behind the rest of the developed countries of nineteenth century Europe.[1] Education remained until the 1930's almost exclusively geared to the Humanities in content and outlook; only in the last thirty years has this changed dramatically,[2] originating from the paradigmatic shift occasioned by the rise of the technocrats who were greatly aided by the United States.

In terms of paradigms, the period from 1812 to 1970 saw the transition from the general dominance of the pre-paradigms to a general dominance of paradigm two. This paradigmatic shift was greatly inspired by foreign example. It was not completely an indigenous Spanish development.[3] Paradigmatic influence was (first paradigm) was brought in by the Bourbons in the eighteenth century to make Spain

conform to the general pattern of enlightened despotism and to raise her prestige. A brief leap to a second paradigm (in intentions only) was made during the reign of Napoleon's brother, Joseph (1808-1813). The influence of paradigm two was clearly discernable in the Cortes of Cádiz and their educational recommendations (1813). Unfortunately, the socio-economic and political make-up of the country was not very conductive to the maintenance of paradigm one much less of paradigm two.[4] The absolutists came back to power from 1814 to 1833 and maintained society in a paradigm one-preparadigm position. The triumph of Liberalism after 1834 did not alter the basic social and economic structure of the country.[5] So, society remained at the first paradigm level. Only after 1876, did the growth and expansion of Catalan industry plus accelerated foreign investment in mining, railroads, etc., led to the influence of a paradigm one and one half position in society; this was followed, under the leadership of the Junta, in the thirties and forties by a concerted attempt to modernize education. All this was indicative of the increasing influence of paradigm two, greatly helped by the loss of power of the elements, or at least the most conservative ones, of society. As a result, there was increased industrialization, and the consequent need for more trained personel acted as a spur to increase the paradigm two influence in education, especially at the university level. The Franco regime was initially paradigmatically reactionary as a result of the reestablishment of the conservative elements of society in

power. But gradually, as a result of American aid, the regime began to allow more progressive elements some power and by 1970 the country had moved into a generally paradigm two position. The country was moving from a state of semi-development to one of development (which is only possible with a paradigm two position). All in all, Spanish education from 1812 to 1970 has reflected both the shift from preparadigms to the second paradigm and the tenacity and resilience of the conservative (often preparadigmatic) element in Spanish life.

The Future

The change to a Liberal government with Franco's death (1976), has not altered essentially the educational plans of the 1970 Education Act save in the importance of the Falange, which is no longer THE political party. Spain has now become politically pluralistic. The affairs and destiny of the nation have become more and more the concern of the new technological industrialists and the more progressive elements of the old industrialists. As Spain industrializes, the influence of the old landowning elite will continue to decline. Thus, the influence of paradigm one and one half will diminish even further. The Catholic Church is an institution largely preparadigmatic in its outlook, however, its influence in the future will probably not decrease and may in fact increase if it modernizes. The reason for this has been the accommodation of the Church to the newer trends in Spanish life- now there are young priests who actively support socialist promises

which are apothegmatic in nature, whereas many of the older priests and the hierarchy are still with the old way of seeing things. The Church has avoided the mistake it made in the nineteenth century when it sided with the rich and conservative against the urban poor. The Spain of the future will not be radically different from Spain of the present. In other words, Spain will no doubt experience a paradigm three and perhaps even an apothegmatic outlook, but it will still be Spain, distinct from other countries.

Further Remarks on Paradigms

The theory of paradigms as set out in this thesis is very similar to the concept of ethos, i.e. the guiding principle or spirit in a culture or civilization. The main distinction is that I envisage a similar set of guiding principles which affect all nations sooner or later in one degree or another, and that this general principle is closely connected to an economic system- if a certain paradigm is in predominance in a society, it will evince the presence of a characteristic sort of economic system in all countries. Thus, paradigms, as I have presented them, are in direct relationship to the economic system, which the ethos is not. Also, the influence is not only from the idea framework to the economic framework but it can also be from the economic framework to the idea framework- it is a two way affair (although it is my opinion that it is more often the case that the influence proceeds from the idea framework to the economic framework).

Concluding Remarks

Spanish education is a tool for development, but it does not cause development- this is true for all countries. Development comes as the result of a change in the mode of production, including the pattern used by society for interpreting reality. This change can only come about if there is a change in the social relations or production and in the world outlook of the people in power in society. By describing a portion of Spanish educational history, I hope to show developing countries the mistakes they are making. Spain began to develop not as a direct result of education but as a result of the change in the controlling elites of the country which has economic consequences. What all developing countries should be doing then, is to concentrate first in developing the economy with the pool of trained people available and supplemented where needed by foreign expertise. Once the economy begins to develop in a sound direction, then education can be concentrated upon. It is then and only then that education will begin to have an effect. Also it must be kept in mind that changes have to reckon with the power structure of society so that before the economic change can take place, there must be a power structure change; if the members of that power structure are too set in their view of reality. Building a truly modern educational system presents more problems than those of finance, lack of teachers, or material, as Spanish education shows it involves all facets of the culture.

[1]The narrow vision of her ruling elite had greatly retarded the progress of the country after the sixteenth century.

[2]This has been due to the demands made by the economy for skilled and educated labour.

[3]This was because after two centuries of the Inquisition the Spanish mind had little time to develop new ideas.

[4]Spain was an extremely backward country in the early nineteenth century.

[5]Because the Liberals themselves wanted the maintenance of the situation which was working well for them.

Bibliography

Anderson, Lewis F., Pestalozzi, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York and London, 1931.

Bergamini, John D., The Spanish Bourbons, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1974.

Blaye De, Edouard, Franco and the Politics of Spain, translated by Brian Pearce, Penguin Books, Pelican Books, 1976, Cox and Wyman Ltd, London, 1976.

Brickman, William W., Educational Reform and Renewal in Contemporary Spain, U.S. Dept of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Institute of International Studies, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1972.

Carr, Raymond, Spain 1808-1939, Oxford University Press, Ely House, London W.I., At the Carendon Press, 1966.

Castillejo, José, Education and Revolution in Spain, Oxford University Press, Amen House, E.C.4, London: Humphrey Milford, 1937.

Castillejo, José, Wars of Ideas in Spain, John Murray, Abemarle St., London, W.I., First edition, 1937.

Castro, Americo, The Structure of Spanish History, translated by Edmund L. King, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1954.

Christiansen, E., The Origins of Military Power in Spain 1800-1854, Oxford University Press, Ely House, London W.I., 1967.

Clarke, Butler, Modern Spain 1815-1898, Cambridge University Press Warehouse, Cambridge, 1906.

Coleman, James S. (editor), Education and Political Development, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1965.

Doherty, Ellen M. and Male, George A., Education in Spain, U. S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1966.

Freedman, Robert (editor), Marx on Economics, A Harvest Book, Harcouty, Brace, and Company, New York, 1961.

Frost Jr., S. E., Historical and Philosophical Foundations of Western Education, Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., Columbus, Ohio, 1966.

Hennessy, C. A. M., The Federal Republic in Spain 1868-74, Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E. C. 4, At the Carendon Press, 1962.

Hills, George, Spain, Praeger Publishers, Inc., 111 Fourth Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10003, 1970.

Holt, Edgar, The Carlist Wars in Spain, Putnam and Company Ltd., 9 Bow Street, London W C 2, 1967.

Horowitz, Morris A., Manpower and Education in Franco Spain, An Archon Book by The Shoe String Press, Inc., Hamden, Connecticut 06514, 1974.

Hume, Martin, Modern Spain, T. Fisher Unwin, I. Adelphi Terrace MCMVI, London, 1906.

International Encyclopedia of Higher Education, Spain, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, California, 94111, Volume 8, 1977.

Kagan, Richard L., Students and Society in Early Modern Spain, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, The Johns Hopkins University Press Ltd., London, 1974.

Kern, Robert W., Liberals, Reformers, and Caciques in Restoration Spain 1875-1909, The University of New Mexico Press, Albuquerque, 1974.

Kuhn, Thomas S., The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 60637, 1962, Second Edition Enlarged, 1970.

Lacomba, Juan A., Introduccion a la História Económica de la España Contemporanea, Guadiana de Publicaciones, S. A., Madrid, 1969.

Lilley, Irene M. (editor), Friedrich Froebel, A Selection from his Writings, Published by the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N. W. I., 1967.

Lovett, Gabriel H., Napoleon and the Birth of Modern Spain, New York University Press, Volume 2, 1965.

Marichal, Carlos, Spain (1834-1844), A New Society, Tamesis Books Ltd., London, 1977.

Ministry of Education and Science, Articles of the General Education Reform Financing Law, As approved by the education commission of the Spanish "Cortes", June, 1970.

Ministry of Education and Science, Report: Educational Reform in Spain, International Conference on Education, XXXII rd Meeting- Geneva, 1st-9th July, 1970.

Monroe, Paul, A Textbook in the History of Education, AMS Press, Inc., New York, N.Y., 10003, 1970.

Ortega y Gasset, José, Mission of the University, edited and translated by Howard Lee Nostrand, Princeton University Press, 1944, The Norton Library W.W. Norton and Company Inc., New York, 1966.

Payne, Stanley G., Falange, Stanford University Press, Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University, Stanford, California, 1961.

Payne, Stanley G., Franco's Spain, Thomas Y. Cromwell Company, New York, 1967.

Payne, Stanley G. (editor), Politics and Society in Twentieth-century Spain, Modern Scholarship on European History, New Viewpoints, A Division of Franklin Watts, New York, London, 1976.

Payne, Stanley G., Spain and Portugal, The University of Wisconsin Press, Box 1379, Madison, Wisconsin 53701, volume 2, 1973.

Perz, J.R., Secondary Education in Spain, Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., 1934.

Petrie, Charles, King Alfonso XIII and his Age, Chapman and Hall Ltd., 37 Essex Street, London WC2, 1963.

Preston, Paul, The Coming of the Spanish Civil War, MacMillan Press Ltd., Bowering Press Ltd., Plymouth, 1978.

Redden, John D. and Ryan, Francis A., A Catholic Philosophy of Education, The Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1956.

Reid, John T., Modern Spain and Liberalism, A Study in Literary Contrasts, Stanford University Press, Stanford University, California, London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press,

Sánchez, José M., Reform and Reaction, Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina Press, 1962,1963, 1964.

Sánchez Albornoz, Claudio, La Drama de la Formacion de España, Editora y Distribuidora Hispano-Americana, S.A.A., Barcelona, 1973.

Trotsky, Leon, The Spanish Revolution (1931-39), Pathfinder Press Inc., 410 West Street, New York, N.Y. 10014, First edition, 1973.

Turin, Yvonne, L'éducation de L'école en Espagne de 1874 a 1902, Libéralisme et Tradition, Presses Universitaires de France, 108, Boulevard Saint-Germain, Paris, 1959.

Ulich, Robert, History of Educational Thought, American Book Company, Harvard University, 1945, 1950.

Appendix One

Financial Aspects of Education, 1964

	Pesetas
General Services	1,261,000,000
Special Services:	
General Secretariat	77,300,000
Central Bords of:	
University Education	879,400,000
Technical Education	470,500,000
Secondary Education	1,251,000,000
Workers' Education	533,900,000
Elementary Education	6,658,900,000
Fine Arts	307,500,000
Archives and Libraries	150,000,000
Miscellaneous	2,500,000
Total	11,592,000,000 ($194,000,000)

Ellen M. Doherty and George A. Male, Education in Spain, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington: 1966, p.5.

The above information shows the pressures on the government to improve education put by the development of the economy during the sixties.

Appendix Two

Average Annual Manpower Needs and Potential Resources of the Educational System, 1967-1971

(in thousands)

Occupational Groups	Manpower Needs	Potential Resources of the Educational System
Managers	0.6	-
High-level technicians	9.1	8.9
Middle-level technicians	17.3	16.6
High-level employees	8.1	6.5
Middle-level employees	32.2	52.1
Low-level employees	47.9	85.3
Master craftsmen & foremen	44.9	4.4
Skilled industrial workers	149.5	242.9
Semi-skilled workers	-1.9	95.9
Unskilled workers	-145.5	-

Morris A. Horowitz, Manpower and Education in Franco Spain, ... Conneticut, 06514, 1974, p. 122.

The information above indicates that the Spanish economy had not yet reached the paradigm three stage where managers become a necessity, but was rapidly moving towards a paradigm two position.